

102a
SEVERAL
LETTERS

Which passed between

Dr. *George Hickes*, A

AND A

Popish PRIEST,

Upon occasion of a

Young Gentlewoman's

Departing from the

Church of *England* to that of *Rome*.

To which is added,

- I. The Answer of Dr. *Bull*, now Bishop of *St. Davids*, to a Query of the Bishop of *Meaux*.
- II. Mr. *Lesley*'s Answer to the same Query.
- III. A Letter written to an English Priest at *Rome*.

With an APPENDIX containing several remarkable PAPERS.

L O N D O N,

Printed by W. B. for RICHARD SARE, at
Grays-Inn-Gate in *Holborn*, 1705.

4

LETTERS

Which passed between

Dr. George Hickes,

AND A

Popish Priest.



Church of England to that of Rome.

To which is added

- I. The Answer of Dr. Tillotson to the Bishop of Meaux.
- II. The Bishop's Answer to the same.
- III. A Letter written to an English Priest at Rome.

With an APPENDIX containing several remarkable Passages.

LONDON,

Printed by W. B. Richardson, 1707.
 Corner of St. Dunstons Church in Fleet Street.

ing of best and therefore desires to know what



gave an occasion to the Reverend Mr. Lally of
writing another answer to it, which he thought
to have sent to Monsieur de Meaux translated
into Latin or French, if he had not been pre-
vented by his death. I thought it might not
improperly accompany the Bishop of St. Davids

Robert Nelson, Esquire.

a part of the Collection of Papers which I have
included with this Letter, I have added a few
that you may see in the English Print
at Rome, which I have also added to the

THE many Titles you have to this Col-
lection of Papers have made the De-
dication of it a matter of necessity,
rather than of choice. It was in a Letter
to you, that the Bishop of Meaux chose to send
the Congratulations, and Thanks of the Cler-
gy of France, assembled at St. Germain to
the most learned Dr. Bull, now Bishop of
St. Davids, for the Service he had done the
Catholick Church in defending the necessity
of believing the Divinity of the Son of God;
in which Letter he professeth, that it is mat-
ter of astonishment to him, that so great a
Man should continue a moment without own-

The Dedication.

ing of her, and therefore desires to know what
he means by the Catholick Church?

It was to you, Sir, that his Lordship sent
his excellent Answer to that Letter, an imper-
fect Abstract of which having stollen into Print,
gave an occasion to the Reverend Mr. Lesly of
writing another answer to it, which he thought
to have sent to Monsieur de Meaux translated
into Latin, or French, if he had not been pre-
vented by his death. I thought it might not
improperly accompany the Bishop of St. Davids
his larger Answer, into the publick, and there-
fore with the Author's consent I have made it
a part of this Collection, which is happily con-
cluded with an excellent Letter of your own,
that you wrote in Italy to an English Priest
at Rome with that felicity of temper, whereof
you are master in great perfection, and by the
benefit of which you can discourse with all
sorts of Men, with whom you differ in matters
of Religion, in the same easie, and obliging
manner, as with those, with whom you do
agree.

You have also many titles to my own part
in this Polemical Collection: For you know
the Gentleman, who drew me against my in-
clination into this Controversie: I acquainted
you time after time with the steps of my pro-
ceeding in it with him, and his Sister; and
I de-

I d
with
on
all
thin
pres
that
and
that
ment
all t
the h
as o
Life,
for
tirefo

In
you,
answ
my le
memo
ny Ye
quain
had
great
gave
the h
mitti
and
your

The Dedication.

I desir'd, had I come to oral Conferences with their Guide, to have you sole witness on my side to what had passed between us in all our Arguments; and for these reasons I think my self oblig'd to make you a publick present of these Papers of Controversie, with that deference which is due to so discerning, and learned a judge; with all the respect that ought to be paid to so great an Ornament of our Church, and Religion; and with all the acknowledgments I ought to make for the honour of your Friendship, which I esteem as one of the providential Blessings of my Life, that God hath been pleased to reserve for me, as a comfort, in the last, and most tiresome part thereof.

In all the Conversation I have had with you, I can truly say, I have found you fully answer the great, and good Character, that my learned and religious Friend of venerable memory, Mr. Kettlewell gave me of you many Years, before it was my happiness to be acquainted with you. The love, and esteem he had for you was to my knowledge exceeding great while he lived, and at his death he gave you a sure testimony of his constancy, in the honourable opinion he had of you in committing his worldly Concerns to your Wisdom, and Trust. Sir, I cannot pretend to merit your Friendship to such a degree, as that wor-

The Dedication.

thy Person deserv'd it, who was one of the best of Christians, and Divines, but I dare pretend to the same degree of affection, and respect, which he had for you to his last breath; and in testimony thereof, I humbly offer this Book to your acceptance, professing my self ambitious of being reckon'd, and continu'd in the number of your most faithful Friends, and Servants.

George Hickes.

Ormond-street,
May 3. 1703.

In all the Conversation I have had with you, I can truly say, I have found you fully answer the great, and good Character, that my learned and religious Friend of venerable memory, Mr. Keblewell gave me of you many Years, before it was my happiness to be acquainted with you. The love, and esteem he had for you was to my knowledge exceeding great while he lived, and at his death he gave you a true testimony of his confidence in you. I am now in a more than ordinary manner, desirous to your Wisdom, and Trust, I cannot pretend to merit your Friendship to such a degree, as that you

104

A

and ever way cas the But una curr part form one I soler conf com ly d Wor prov wha in m

† c

THE PREFACE.

I Never yet entered into Controversie, but against my Inclinations, which have always carried me to cultivate the more quiet, and practical part of Divinity, and therefore ever since I received *Holy Orders*, I have always taken care to sing, but never sought occasions of engaging my self in the Disputes of the times relating either to Church, or State. But contrary to my *Genius* I have been sometimes unavoidably constrained, both by single, and concurrent accidents, to write *Polemical Discourses*, particularly in the Controversies betwixt the reformed Church of *England*, and that unreformed one of *Rome*.

I was the first time forced to write by the insolence of a Popish Physician, who had the confidence to tell one of my [†] Parishioners in company, that whereas I had in a Sermon lately deliver'd some things concerning the popish Worship of Saints, I was a Lyar, and could not prove what I asserted, and bid him tell me what he said. This insult making a great noise in my own and the neighbouring Parishes, I

† Of All-Saints Berking, London.

The Preface.

was compelled in Vindication of my Religion, as well as of my Reputation, to publish a Book in the Year 1686, intituled, *Speculum beatae Virginis, A Discourse of the due Praise and Honour of the Virgin Mary*; in which I think I proved contrary to what that Physician maintain'd, that the *Roman Catholicks* do much more than desire the Saints to pray for them, *as sick Men desire the Prayers of the Congregation*, or that they only pray to the Saints in Heaven, *as they do to their Brethren on Earth to pray for them, in the name and mediation of Christ*.

Shortly after this I was forced again in another place to publish a Discourse in the Year 1687, intituled, *An Apologetical Vindication of the Church of England, in answer to those, who reproach her with the English Heresies, and Schisms*. I say, I was forced to it by the perpetual din of some more zealous, than prudent, or modest Roman Catholick Gentlemen, whose practice it then was to ask our People in Coffee-Houses, and other places, *What the Church of England was? Where it was to be found? and if it was the Presbyterians, or Independents, or Anabaptists, or Quakers?* And then after these, and such like impertinent, and provoking questions, they used to bid them go to their Bishop, or their Dean, and pray either of them to let them know in such a number of Sects, *where they might find the Church of England?*

The excellent * Bishop, worthy of everlasting Memory, being by long Sickness then reduced to a very weak condition, the province of

Worcester.

* Dr. William Thomas.

vindicating

The Preface.

vindicating our Church against the open Reproaches of those Gentlemen was devolved providentially upon me; of which by God's assistance I acquitted my self in that Discourse with such success, that after the publishing of it those Gentlemen became very quiet, and never after, that I could hear of, reproached the Church of England with the English Heresies, and Schisms.

I am now a third time engaged in Controversie with an unknown Adversary, and by an unforeseen accident, which was not in my power to prevent. In the Octaves of Christmas last was twelvemonth, as I happened to be alone in my own House, a young Gentleman of good appearance and address came to me, and after making an apology in such manner as the civility of Strangers obligeth them to do, he told me he came to ask me a question, which I remember; was to this effect: *Whether the Fathers were not the best judges between the Church of England, and the Church of Rome in the Controversie concerning the Doctrine of Transubstantiation?* To which I reply'd in these, or the like words: *That the consentient Testimony of the Fathers was undoubtedly the best, and surest evidence for, or against the truth of any Doctrines in dispute between the two Churches; and particularly in the Controversie of Transubstantiation we of the Church of England were willing to have it try'd by that Testimony, whether that Doctrine were true, or false.* Then he asked me, if I had read a Book entituled *Nubes Testium*; I answer'd, that I had read it about nineteen Years ago, when it was first publish'd. Then he ask'd me again, if the Fathers cited in that Book were truly cited? to which I reply'd, that to the best
of

The Preface.

of my remembrance many of them were partially cited, and all falsely, fallaciouſly, and impertinently apply'd; adding that a good answer to it had been publiſh'd many Years ſince, to which I referr'd him. He told me, he had not heard of that Answer, and ſo other Company coming in to interrupt all farther Diſcourſe, he took leave; when waiting upon him to the door without asking his name, I deſir'd to know, if he ask'd that queſtion about *Transubſtantiation* upon his own account, or of ſome other Perſon? *Not upon my own account, Sir,* (ſaid he with an accent of Zeal) *for I thank God I am a Roman Catholick, but for another Perſon.*

Some time after he came to me again to deſire me, as he was pleas'd to ſpeak, to give a charitable viſit that Evening to a Gentlewoman at his Houſe. I then began to apprehend what was coming upon me; and having ask'd where his Houſe, and who that Gentlewoman was, I told him I would wait upon her that Evening, betwixt five, and ſix a Clock. This Gentlewoman was his Siſter, whom he had proſelyted to the Church of *Rome*. At the time appointed, I went, as I promiſed, to his Houſe, where he was pleas'd to conduct me up ſtairs with great civility to the dining room; where ſeeing two Gentlewomen, I ask'd him which of them was his Siſter; which having told me, we ſat down, and then he ſaid, *Sir, the queſtion my Siſter would ask of you is this, Whether the Fathers, &c. as in the queſtion he had ask'd me at my Houſe. After he had repeated the queſtion, I ſpoke to his Siſter in theſe words: Madam, before I answer this, I muſt beg leave to ask you another queſtion, to which I expect you'll return a plain, poſitive answer: Are you already reconciled*

The Preface

to the Church of Rome, or not? This question, as I perceived, was not expected from me, because it put the Lady to a stand, who after a longer silence, than such an easie question needed, reply'd *Indeed, Sir, I cannot deny, but that I am almost perfectly satisfied.* Then said I, *Madam, why was I sent for?* I am desired to come to you, as Physicians sometimes are to visit Patients, when there are no hopes of recovery. I said a great deal more upon that occasion, as I thought, I had just reason, which I judge needless to repeat, and then proceeded to give the same answer to the question her Brother had put for her, which I had given him before; adding, *that if they pleased to put the merit of the Controversie between the two Churches upon the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and try it by the testimony of the Fathers, I would be content to allow one day in every Week to examine the Fathers of the five first Centuries, with her Guide, or any other of their Priests, in order to come to an issue in that point; and when her Brother objected, that would take up too much time, I offered to make short work of it by agreeing to stand or fall in that dispute by the sole authority, and testimony of St. Augustin, the great Doctor of the Latin Church.* But this neither being accepted, I took leave, not expecting to hear any more from them.

Not many days after the Gentleman came again to me in the Evening, to tell me his Sister desired to give me a visit, which, altho' fasting, and wearied with a long walk, I consented to receive within an hour. He came along with her, and after common forms upon such occasions, he told me, that what I had said to his Sister of the danger she would be in, if she turned Roman Catholick, had made her desirous

once

The Preface.

once more to speak with me. This gave me a new occasion to set before her the great danger of her Apostacy. I told her again, that the moment she went over to the Church of *Rome*, she must be responsible to God for all the Errors, Abuses, and Corruptions of it in Doctrine, Worship, and Government, which were many, and grievous; and I beseech'd her by her eternal Salvation to give her self time to compare the Doctrine, Worship, and Government of the two Churches one with the other, in their Creeds, Offices, and Constitutions, telling her, that was the best way to judge which of the two Communions was the most pure, and primitive, when they were so set one against the other. I told her common decency, and the duty she ow'd the Church in which she had been bred, required she should do this, and I offer'd to assist, and direct her in the work; putting her in mind, how many Months she had conversed with Romish Priests without once communicating her doubts to any Minister of the Church of *England*, and that justice to her self, as well as to the Cause of the Religion she had professed, required she should be impartial, and hear from us at one Ear, as she had a long time hearkened to our Adversaries at the other. At least, I told her, she ought to have a new hearing of the Cause before us, and them together, that otherwise her partiality would aggravate the Crime of her revolt, and that her danger would be much greater, than that of those who were bred up in the Church of *Rome*. And because we had discoursed of Transubstantiation, I begg'd leave to set before her the contradictions of that Doctrine, its inconsistencies with the Latin Canon of the Mass, and offer'd to shew her the monstrous

stro
it r
Blo
the
fal
of
by
his
shou
Hie
that
arise
nien
by
live
A
wou
min
Writ
thers
again
the
rence
Chur
spite
find
Gent
defect
In
he se
unkn
versie
time
I told
ther n
and t
feared

The Preface.

stuous and horrible indignities, and dishonours it reflected upon our Saviour's blessed Body, and Blood, supposing such defects should happen in the celebration of the Mass, as the Roman Missal recites. I also offer'd again to try the truth of that Doctrine by the Fathers, particularly by St. *Augustin*, if she would be concluded by his authority. But she said, she had rather it should be try'd by St. *Cyril*, meaning St. *Cyril of Hierusalem*, to which I consented, telling her, that to determine any Disputes, which might arise from *Cyril's* words, it would be convenient at the Conference to have the Fathers by us, who wrote in the Age wherein he lived.

After this I expected, when the Conference would be appointed, in which we were to examine the Doctrine of Transubstantiation by the Writings of St. *Cyril*, or some others of the Fathers; but after some days her Brother came again to tell me, that the Gentleman, meaning the *Missioner*, I was to meet, desired the Conference might be about *the Infallibility of the Church*. This I also accepted, desiring the Dispute might be in Writing. But, as you will find in my Adversaries reply to my answer, the Gentleman mistook the *Infallibility* for the *Indefeasibility* of the Church.

In order to this dispute about *Indefeasibility*, he sent me a Paper called a *Query* from my unknown Adversary, with which our Controversie began. I was very unwilling at that time to enter into Controversie, being then, as I told him, intent upon a great Work of another nature, which was enough for all my time, and thoughts. But there was no remedy, for I feared, had I declin'd the Dispute, that ill me
would

The Preface.

would have been made of it, and perhaps it was not without the special Providence of God, that I was brought under a necessity to leave this testimony behind me against the Popery of the Roman Church; concerning which I here declare, that if I were in such streights, that I could not upon Catholick Principles joyn my self to any other Communion, I must rather chuse to dye, as some good Men have done, in the melancholy-state of *Segregation*, than joyn in Communion with the Church of *Rome*.

How two of the other Papers of Controversie in this *Collection* came to be written, doth appear in p. 227. from the Bishop of *Meaux's* Letter, which he wrote to that most worthy Gentleman Mr. *Nelson*. An imperfect abstract of this, which stole into print, invited the Reverend Mr. *Lesley* to write an answer in another Letter to that famous Bishop; which if his Lordship had lived, he design'd to send him. Having told me he had written such a Letter, I desir'd him to communicate it to me; which when he had done, I imparted to him what I had written in the Controversie, and proposed to him to let me publish his Letter to the Bishop with my Papers, to which he consented, if I thought it fit to be made publick. After I had read it I shew'd it to Mr. *Nelson*, who told me he daily expected an answer to Monsieur de *Meaux's* Letter from the Reverend Dr. *Bull*, which he shortly after received from him. When he perused the learned Doctor's answer, he did me the favour to communicate it to me. I read it over with that great delight, and satisfaction, I expected from so great a Pen, which obliged me to desire him to let the Doctor know, what I intended to publish, and to pray him to give

leave

leave
to ap
his g
quest
and
itan
lent
woul
dimi
add
could
his n
in L
Fait
the t
neral
pen
from
whic
ctor
of Fr
be ba
fendi
the S
Th
excel
Deist
titud
gotte
his p
forth
bisho

† To
of Rom
they an
lingwor
bury's-L

The Preface.

leave that my Papers might have the honour to appear in publick with his. The Doctor of his great Humility was pleased to grant my request, and I make this greatful mention of his, and Mr. *Lesley's* condescension, because I esteem it an honour to have the Papers of two such excellent Men seen in one Collection with mine. It would indeed be great arrogance in me, and a diminution of them, if I should think I could add to either of their praise by any thing I could say of them; one of them having made his name immortal, by his most learned Works in Latin, in which he defended the *Nicene Faith* against *Sandius*; for which he received the thanks of our generous Adversaries, the *General Assembly* of the Gallican Church by the pen of *Monfieur de Meaux* in his Letter dated from *St. Germain's*, where the Assembly sat. In which he desired Mr. *Nelson* to acquaint the Doctor with the Congratulations of all the Clergy of France there assembled, For the great service he hath done the Catholick Church in so well defending the necessity of believing the Divinity of the Son of God.

The other is well known among us for his excellent Writings in English against *Atheists*, *Deists*, *Socinians*, *Quakers*, *Erastians*, and *Latitudinarians*, for which he will never be forgotten; and one thing is to be added, not for his praise (for that is due to God) but to set forth his felicity, that since the time of Archbishop *† Laud*, and Dr. *Tb. Moreton* Bishop of

† To the number of twenty two Profelytes from the Church of Rome, as he pleaded at his Trial in his own defence, where they are all named. One of these was the famous Mr. *Chillingworth*. This his Persecutors could not deny. See *Canterbury's Doom* by *William Pryme*, p. 55.

The Preface.

Durham, no Man hath had his Labours blessed with such success, or made so many Converts from Error to Truth, and from no Principles to Principles, and so considerable among their several Parties, as he.

The last Paper, with which mine have the honour to appear abroad, is a Letter which Mr. *Nelson* wrote in his foreign Travels, to an *English* Priest at *Rome*. After he had obtained Dr. *Bull*'s consent, that his Papers should be printed with mine, I thought he would not deny me his own, which he had communicated to me. I asked it of him, because I had a mind to secure it to the publick, and shew Gentlemen by so good an Example how they may travel abroad with reputation to their Religion and Country, as well as to themselves. I need say no more of this Gentleman, whose great worth, and talents are known every where by his most excellent Book of the *Festivals, and Fasts of the Church*, which is receiv'd with the highest commendation in all places. For besides the acceptance it hath in a short time found at home in so many Editions, it is now a translating abroad into several foreign Languages, for the benefit of the publick where those Languages are spoke. In his travels he easily got acquaintance with many great Men, of which the Bishop of *Meaux* was one, and I cannot but think, that by his prudent mediation between the Bishop, and his learned Adversaries, the Controversie would have been carried on with great decency, and to very good effect; but it was not God's time, who took the Bishop out of the World, before these Letters were sent to him.

Indeed Controversie, tho' not pleasant in it self, loses much of its unpleasant nature, when

one

one
pon
mis
of a
Gou
Fox
Lin
ragr
thro
forg
tion
lacie
he ho
an op
my s
I l
wind
hath
thrice
pardo
ble, a
them
the fa
have
thoriti
and A
some p
in illu
of the
Church
esteeme
of. I
thoritie
Greeks
might
hath be
Writers,

The Preface.

One hath to do with such fair, and generous Opponents, as that famous Bishop. But it is my misfortune to enter the Lists with an Adversary of another *Genius*, who seeming to want the noble Courage of the Lion, hath used all the Tricks of a Fox, in playing the part of a Sophister in every Line of his *Complicat Query*, and in every Paragraph of his defence thereof; treating me throughout, as if I had never learned, or had forgot my *Logick*, and the Laws of Disputation, or were to be puzzled, or baffled with Fallacies, with which, I am tempted to believe, he hoped to tire me, or, it may be, had so mean an opinion of me, as to think they were above my skill to solve.

I have been forced to follow him in all his windings, and turnings, as he led me; which hath caused me to repeat some things twice, or thrice over; which the Reader, I hope, will pardon, because my repetitions were unavoidable, and because I have endeavoured to make them short. I have also been forced to prove the same things in several places, but then I have taken care to prove them by several Authorities, because I thought some Testimonies, and Authorities more convenient, and proper in some places, than others, and they all concur in illustrating the natural, and true notion of the *Catholick Church*; and to shew that the Church of *Rome*, in ancient times, was never esteemed more than one Part, or Member thereof. I have industriously made use of the Authorities, and Arguments of the more modern *Greeks* against the *Latins*, because I thought it might probably be as pleasant to others, as it hath been to me, to observe how they, and our Writers, without any communication one with
b another,

The Preface.

another, argue in the same manner against the Papal Usurpations, and the Arrogance, and Absurdity of the *Romish* Writers, in appropriating to the Church of *Rome* the stile of the *Catholick Church*. For the same reason I have also cited the Authority, and Opinions of the free Writers of the *Gallican Church*, which if Monsieur *de Meaux* ever read, I wonder he should ask Dr. *Bull*, what he meant by the *Catholick Church*? It is written of our blessed Lord, that he marvelled at the unbelief of his Countrymen, and considering the Learning, and Penetration of Monsieur *de Meaux*, one would be astonished that he should put that Question, and not understand, and believe the *Catholick Church* to be one Society, or Body spiritual made up of all faithful Churches, of which Christ alone is the Head. But contrary to this true and easie notion of it, the *Roman* Doctors make the present *Roman*, and *Catholick Church* to be Equipollent, and Convertible terms, and whenever they speak of *the Church*, or *the Catholick Church*, they only understand their own Church by it, which in all Disputes with us they commonly suppose, and take for granted to be the whole *Catholick Church*. My Adversary supposeth it to be so in his *Query*, and is much out of humour in his *Reply*, because I took notice of it in my Answer. This obliged me to shew at large the notion the Ancients had of the *Catholick Church*, and of the *Roman*, as a Part of it out of the Fathers; and I am glad I did it, Mr. *Lesley* having shew'd it only out of St. *Cyprian* in his Letter, and the most Learned Dr. *Bull* having not insisted on it, as being needless to his Design, which was to shew at large the Corruptions of the *Roman Church*, which I have done only summarily, and in short,
and

The Preface.

and Mr. *Lesley* wholly omitted, as thinking himself only obliged to let the Bishop of *Meaux* know, what we mean by the *Catholick Church*.

My Adversary, in his Letter of *April 10th*, p. 207, 208. for Answer to what hath been written against Transubstantiation by *Albertinus*, and the Pope's Supremacy by *Launoy*, and Dr. *Barrow*, refers me to *GUALTERUS* and *COCCIUS*, two such doughty Champions of their Church, as I am confident, that many of their learned Men, would now be ashamed to refer their Opponents to in those, or any other Points. Of *Coccius* I have given † an account enough to make a modest Adversary blush. But I could not then give any account of *GUALTERUS*, because I could not get his Book, which is very scarce among us. The Title of it is, *Tabula Chronologica statûs Ecclesiæ Catholicæ à Christo nato ad Annum MDCXIV. In qua duodenis Columnis exhibentur summi Pontifices, & Antipapæ, Concilia, & Patriarchæ quatuor veterum Ecclesiarum, &c. Nec non veterum errorum cum recentioribus Calvinianæ Sectæ heresibus, ac demum duodecim ex iis, quas vel nunc Calvinismus impugnat, Catholicarum veritatum Confirmatio, &c. Autore Jacobo Gualtero. Lugduni MDCXVI.*

Seven of his twelve *Catholick Verities* are, *Transubstantiation*; *Invocation of Saints*; *The religious Use and Veneration of Relicks and Images*, especially of the holy Cross; *The Celibacy of Priests*; *Purgatory*, and *Prayers for the Dead*; *The Primacy of St. Peter*, and *the Roman Church*; *The Infallibility of the Church, in her Decisions, Decrees, and Traditions*. Which he proves by forged, and spurious Writings, or by the Words

† P. 208.

The Preface.

of true Authors egregiously wrested, and misapplied. Let us give some account of the noble Achievements of this *Catholick* Champion, of which his first Century will afford us a Specimen. There he goes about to prove Transubstantiation out of the *spurious* Martyrdom of St. *Andrew*, said to be written by *Achaïas* the Presbyter, particularly out of his Confession, which that Forger relates him to have made before *Ægeas* the Tyrant. Another of his Authorities is taken out of the Epistle to the People of *Bordeaux*, forged in the name of St. *Martialis*, to which I may add the Liturgies of St. *Peter*, St. *James* the Elder, and of St. *Matthew*, and St. *Mark*, as if written by them; and the Works under the name of *Pseudo Dionysius Areopagita*, as if they had been written in that Century by the true *Areopagite*. In this Century he also cites the *spurious* Acts of the Passion of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*, forged in the name of St. *Linus*, the *spurious* Epistle of St. *Ignatius* to *Heron* the Deacon, and what is said in the name of the Apostles in the interpolated Apostolical Constitutions falsely ascrib'd to St. *Clement Romanus*. In his Collation of the Errours of this Century with those of the *Calvinistical* Sect, by which he understands the Protestants in general, the Title of the first Chapter is, *De Juda Iscariote Sacramentarium Principe*; Of *Judas Iscariot* the chief of the *Sacramentarians*; where he also writes thus: "*Judas Iscariot*, the Traytor, who was the first Apostate, and first Heretic of Christianity, may of right be esteemed the first Architect of the pretended *Calvinian* Reformation, especially in three things. First, In impugning the holy Mass, and Reality of the Eucharist, &c. This is my Adversary's *Catholick* Champion of the *Catholick* Verities,

to

The Preface.

to whom he sends me for an Answer to *Alber-
tinus*, *Launoy*, and *Barrow*, tho' the eldest of
them wrote nine and thirty Years after him, and
if he thinks him such a noble defender of *their*
Catholick Verities, let him put the issue of the
Controversies about them betwixt their Church,
and ours upon his authorities, and proofs. Let
him prove out of him, if he can, that the Do-
ctrines in dispute between us, and them, were
Doctrines of Faith in the five first Centuries.
This I have often called upon him to do, and
if he can prove That out of *Gualterus's* authori-
ties, an author to whom he hath in a manner
appealed, it will be much for his honour, to
make his proofs good.

In the 70th page I have cited an ancient poe-
tical harmony of the Gospels extant in the *Cot-
tonian Library*, written in the *Francick*, or old
German Tongue. In which I have observed there
are no *Titles*, or Appellations given to the ever-
blessed Virgin *Mary*, but such as any Protestant
may give her, especially in a Poem, as that
History of our Saviour's Life is. The Original
Titles I have since met with in my Collections,
and judge it not inconvenient to set them down
here, hoping they may gratifie the curious Rea-
der (as certainly they will, if he be studious
of *the old Septentrional Learning*) as well, as prove
what I affirmed,

Munelica magat. Thia Davibes dohtor diur-
lic Wif, Waldenbe Wurching. Idis ensho ful,
Ures drohtines moðor, idereu rcomioft, ellerq
Wiuo whitigost. Theru helagun thiornum Ma-
rium thero guobun. Wifo scomiofta. Fagar
helag thiorno, thiu magat. Fagero frjo scomi-
ofta thiu moðor. Mið thero Godes thiornum,
Idis thero Guobun. Giwritun him than te hus

The Preface.

thanan fan Hierusalem Ioseph endi Maria he-
 lag hiwyrki; Habbun im hefan Cuning rimla
 te gerithe runo drohtines. Endi ina that Wis
 behels thi thorno Gethiubo. Mid thero guo-
 dan thornan. Liwitun im thuo eft an Galileo
 Land Ioseph endi helag hiwyrki hefan Cuninges.
 Gifragh after thi eft othron sage athal cunnes
 Wis salig thiorna that hie under them gerithe
 ni was. Thiu Godes thiorna. Muelica magat
 thar Maria was mid iro runie jelfo salig thiorna
 Mahtiges muober. Than stuoð thar a Maria
 muoder Cristes blec under them bome. Ibis un-
 wemma. *The Sanctimonial Virgin. The Daugh-*
ter of David, dearly beloved Woman worthy of
the Lord. Lady full of Grace. Mother of our
Lord, fairest of Ladies, most beautiful of all Wo-
men. Of the holy Maiden, Mary the pious. Fair-
est of Women. The fair holy Maiden, the Virgin.
The most beautiful Mother of a fair Off-spring.
With the Maiden of God. Of the Virtuous Lady.
Then Joseph, and Mary his holy Wife returned
home from Hierusalem, always having the King
of Heaven, the Son of God, in their Company.
And that Woman the blessed Maiden beheld (it)
the Star. With the devout Maiden. Then Joseph,
and the holy Spouse of the King of Heaven return-
ed into Galilee. After this the Woman of noble
Race, the blessed Maiden, understood that he was
not in the Company. The Maiden of God. There
Mary the sanctimonial Virgin, the blessed Maiden,
Mother of the Almighty, was her self with her Son.
Then Mary the Mother of Christ stood all the while
there astonish'd under the Cross. The unblemish'd
Lady.

She is also often plainly without Epithets
 called *Maria, Mary.* Thiu is, *the Lady.* Thiu
 thiorna, *the Maiden.* Is muober, *his Mother.*
That

The Preface.

That Wif, *the Woman*. Thū magat, *the Virgin*, &c. Here is no *Gloriosa Domina*; no *Regina Cælorum*; no *Domina Angelorum*; no *Regina Mater Misericordiæ*; no *Spes nostra*; no *Mater Gratiæ*; no *Maris stella*; no *Cæli Porta*; no *Gloriosa intercessio*; no *Regis alti janua*; no *Porta lucis*; no *Cæli Fenestra*; in short, nothing of her Merits, and Intercession, not one Prayer to her for any Mercy temporal, or spiritual Blessing, nor any *Apostrophe* like a Prayer. Which with the Poet's plain description of the Institution of the holy Eucharist, which I have printed in p. 191, of my *Saxon Grammar*, as well as the Language in which the Book is written, make me believe the Author wrote it about the time of *Charles the Great*, before, or not long after the second Council of *Nice*, when the *Northbern World* was not yet taught the worshipping of Saints, nor the doctrine of the corporal presence of Christ in the holy Eucharist; of which, as *Bellarmino*, and *Sirmundus* both acknowledge, *Paschasius Radbertus*, Monk of *Corbey*, was the first teacher who flourished some time before the middle of the ninth Century. This Doctrine, after the first broaching of it, was always opposed in the English-Saxon Church, as is evident not only from *Ælfric's Paschal Homily*, but many other passages of the *Saxon MSS.* cited in both the † Volumes of the *Septentrional Literature*, which I lately publish'd at *Oxford*. And it never was taught in *England* till the Normans subdu'd it. When *Landfranc* being made Archbishop of *Canterbury* wrote against *Berengarjus*. And about that time, I suppose, it was when that Homily was made for the CORPORAL PRE-

† Vol. I, p. 58, 63; Vol. II, p. 109, 110, 111.

The Preface.

SENCE, of which Mr. Wanley hath given the World a Specimen in the 227 page, col. 1. of the second Volume of the *Septentrional Literature*, cited above in the preceding period.

In p. 189. I have cited Sir *Humphrey Lynde* with particular respect, and I cannot but wish for the Honour of our Church, and the publick Good, that his excellent Works, *Via tuta*, and *Via devia* were reprinted with Dr. *Featly's* Defence of him against the impudent Jesuit, *J. R.*

I must also inform my Reader, that whatever he shall find inserted within these marks [] in my answer to my Adversaries reply, was not in the Copy I sent him, but is since added at more leisure for the farther proof, and illustration of what I first wrote. I have also taken the liberty to change some words, and expressions in the written Copy, not to alter the sense in any place, but because I thought the words and expressions I have put in the printed Copy more proper and significant of it than those in the written Answer were, I wrote down all those alterations with a design to print them in this Preface, and I am sorry that I am disappointed by the loss of them; but if my Adversary thinks I have done him any wrong, or taken any unjust advantage against him by them, he hath free liberty to print them, if he thinks they will expose me, and do him any service.

I have also added an APPENDIX of Papers, because I thought them all very useful, and serviceable to our Religion, and some of them of such a nature, as ought never to be out of Print. The first is a Paper of Mr. *Herbert Thorndike* to shew that the Church of *Rome* may err in matters of Salvation. They were his last thoughts of Popery, which he sent to a Lady a little before

The Preface.

fore his death, and I was the more willing to reprint them, because many misapply'd, and wrested passages have of late been cited out of his Works in the late *Essay towards a proposal for Catholick Communion*, which with all its Arts, Contrivances, and Fallacies is one of the best Evidences, I know, of a necessity of reformation in the Doctrine, Worship, and Government of the Church of Rome. The II Paper is a Letter of Mr. *Chillingworth*, about the Infallibility of the Church of Rome. I have publish'd it again from a late printed Copy, because I think it worthy to be read of all Men, especially by Protestants, who when they happen to be assaulted publickly, or privately by Popish Priests may make this use of it, to desire them to answer that Letter, and in the mean time to forbear. The III Paper is the Creed of Pope *Pius IV*. In publishing of which I have follow'd the Example of Sir *Humphrey Lynde*, because I would have all Protestants to know it, and the prodigious Impositions of the Church of Rome in matters of Faith by the knowledge of it. The Missioners conceal it, as much as they can from the knowledge of those they go about to pervert. I have known some of their Profelytes, who never heard of it; and the Author of *the Essay* above cited, hath no other way of accounting for the additions in it, but by saying, that the profession of Faith in the close of it, *This true Catholick Faith, out of which NO MAN CAN BE SAVED, which at this time I profess willingly, and truly hold, I promise, vow, and swear, I will take care, as much as in me lies, that the same shall be most constantly kept, and confessed (with God's help) whole, and inviolable to the last gasp, and be bolden, taught, and preached by those who are*
under

The Preface.

under me, or such as by my Office I am to take care of. I the said N. promise, vow, and swear (this) as God shall help me, and these Gospels of God; I say, that Author hath no way to bring off their Church from imposing those additions, but by affirming that the *Nicene Creed* in the beginning of that Creed are the *Contents*; I suppose he would have us understand the *Object* of this profession, and that a Man may make a profession of *that Faith* out of which none can be saved, if he consents to the *Nicene Creed*, tho' he doth not approve of the other Articles that follow. Dares he teach this at *Rome*, or in any Popish Country? Will he get the Pope to make this declaration *ex Cathedra*? Will the *Apostolical Vicars* among us admit us upon such a declaration, when we are reconciled? When he shall obtain the Pope's licence to print this at *Rome*, or publish it by his Authority among us, it will then be time enough for us to make Proposals for what he calls *Catholick Communion*, but before it is too soon. In the mean time I pray this Reconciler to consider, what he would think of a Man, who after he had solemnly before Witness signed and sealed a Covenant containing *xxiv* Articles, and also vowed, and sworn faithfully to perform them, should afterwards when he was called upon to perform them, pretend that he only obliged himself to the performance of the first twelve.

The IV Paper, concerning the differences in the chief points of Religion between the Church of *Rome*, and the Church of *England*, was never before published. I printed it from the very Copy, which Dr. *John Cosins*, afterwards Bishop of *Durham*, gave to the late Countess of *Peterborough*; and from the Popish Creed, and this Paper,

Pape
of T
stand
ever
the
been
who
whic
matt
all th
to t
foun
to m
give
tragi
than
Conc
Can
woul
sity,
you
Devo
ing a
at di
tarw
cover
histo
Cros
ctrin
crees
Chur
lastly
secre
of th
rors,
Divi
parti

The Preface.

Paper, which is an extract out of the Council of *Trent*, Men may truly and rationally understand what *Popery* is, of which I cannot but wish every Man had a just, and right Notion. But the mistakes that Men have made about it have been of various, and ill consequences. Many who had been taught, that things were *Popery*, which are not, finding themselves misled in some matters, have suspected they were deceived in all the rest, and so became more easie Profelytes to the Church of *Rome*. Others, who never found their mistakes, have been carried by them to most unchristian practices, of which Histories give a most tragical Account. And none more tragical, and scandalous to the *Protestant Name*, than *Prynne's* History of the Charge, Tryal, and Condemnation of Archbishop *Laud*, entituled, **Canterbury's Doom**; a Book which alone would convince any serious Man of the necessity, and truth of a Judgment to come. There you shall find the daily use of the vii times of Devotion, commonly call'd the vii *Hours*; bowing at the name of Jesus; the wearing of Copes at divine Service; setting of the holy Table Altarwise with steps to it, and rails about it, and a covering upon it; the purely ornamental, and historical use of the Pictures of Christ upon the Cross, and the Resurrection; the *Arminian* Doctrines about Free Will, Justification, the Decrees of God, &c, in which the Divines of the Church of *Rome* differ among themselves; and lastly, the ancient Prayer of Oblation, and Consecration of the holy Eucharist, by invocation of the holy Spirit, all arraigned for Popish Errors, and Innovations, and many Bishops and Divines, of whom the World was not worthy, particularly Dr. *Cosins*, Author of this Paper,
branded

The Preface.

branded for Papists; some of which lived to be great Ornaments of our Church after the happy Restauration, as they had been Champions, and Confessors for it before. Other Books will shew you how the Surplice, the Sign of the Cross, the Ring in Marriage have been treated, as Popish Ceremonies; nay, that the Liturgy, as such, hath been represented as Popish, and Episcopacy it self branded as a Popish Usurpation. All which is owing to Mens ignorance of Popery, and the mistaken Notions they have of it. And I cannot but wish, that some learned Man, after Dr. *Cosins's* Example, would more largely shew the difference in Doctrine, Worship, and Government between the Church of *England*, and the Church of *Rome*, not only out of the Council of *Trent*, but out of their Missal, Ritual, Breviary, Pontifical, and other Offices. Such a Book would be a rewardable Work of great Charity to the Souls of the People, of great Service to the Church of *England*, and also tend very much to the honour, and benefit of the Clergy; the best part of which, who are more Consciencious, than to humour the People in their mistakes, have been, and still will be suspected, if not slandered for Papists, or popishly affected by those who do not truly know what *Popery* is. It would also contribute much to the publick Peace of Church, and State, by obviating the designs of crafty and cruel Demagogues, who abuse the ignorance, and credulity of the vulgar by calling what things they please *Popish*, and making Papists of whomsoever they have a mind to destroy. Thus they wrought the destruction of the great, and learned Prelate above-mentioned, and still in vain endeavour to murder him over again in his honour, and thus they have done, and thus they will do,

The Preface.

do, as opportunity serves, unto the end of the World.

The V Paper is a Form, or prescribed Office of Worship for the daily Devotion of the vii Hours of Prayer, made in all appearance for the use of the Clergy, and more particularly for the use of Religious Houses, in which, I believe, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Psalms, the Hymns were alternatly chanted, or sung, according to the Psalmody, or plain sort of Church-Musick in those times. Such Offices were anciently instituted in the Church; for we read of vi set hours of daily Prayer in the *Constitutions attributed to the Apostles*, lib. viii. cap. xxxiv. which begins thus: *Make Prayers at the dawning of the day, at the third hour, at the sixth, the ninth, and at Evening, and at Cock-crowing, &c.* So St.† Hierom speaking of the Monastick Virgins in his Epistle ad Eustochium, saith he, they sung the Psalms at break of day, at the third hour, the sixth, and the ninth, at Evening, and at Midnighr. Mr. John Spelman, Son of Sir Henry, thought himself obliged to print the Latin Prayers at the end of the *Latino-Saxonick Psalter for their Purity*. For the same reason Mr. Wheloc printed some Saxon Prayers in his Edition of *Bede* with the Saxon Version, and Mr. Junius others at the end of his *Cadmon*. In like manner the Purity, and chast-

† See also his 7th and 8th Epist. and Cassian de Cenob. Instit. lib. 3. cap. 4.

|| Ad finem Psalmi uniuscujusque optima reperuntur preces in animum Psalmi cujusve compositae. Nos, quamvis ad Linguae Saxonice notitiam nihil prorsus conducant, eas tamen una publicandas æquum duximus. Tum ut librum ipsum fideliter recitemus, tum ut antiquioris Ecclesie Anglicanae praxim Synceram ob oculos ponamus, quæ sub illo tempore, ut videtur, nec Beatorum animas, nec Beatissimam Virginem Mariam, nec crucem Domini adorandas docuit.

The Preface.

ness of this daily Office invited me to publish it, as a Specimen of Worship among the Saxons, in which there is not one direct Address, or Prayer to any Saint, but only a devout wish, or desire grounded on the belief of the general intercession of Saints, *that the Virgin Mary, the holy Mother of God, and all the Saints may intercede unto the Lord for us Sinners, that we may be accounted worthy to be assisted, and saved by him:* The words after the Collect for the day are: *Sancta Dei Genetrix Virga Maria, & omnes Sancti intercedant pro nobis peccatoribus ad Dominum Dominorum, ut mereamur ab eo adjuvari, & salvari, qui † vivis, & regnas, &c.*

Not knowing the time when this Office was composed, I will not guess at it. But this I dare say, that when it was made, the worshipping or invocation of Saints had not yet taken place among our Saxon Ancestors; or was yet introduced into any Offices of the English-Saxon Church. It is not till the Xth Century, that we find any footsteps of it, when in the Homilies on the fictitious Assumption of the blessed Virgin, we find them conclude in these, or such like words; *Uton nu geornlice biððan þa eadigan Marian þe nu to † ðær sær ahasen 7 geferes buran engle þnumme. † heo up þingie to pam ælmihtigan Gode. Se þe Leofað 7 nixað on ealpa ƿopulða ƿopulð. AMEN.* Come then let us now earnestly pray the blessed Mary, who was this day taken up, and exalted above the dignity of Angels, that she would intercede for us

† L. Vivit, regnat.

* The spelling of this word with (i) shews that this Homily was written towards the latter end of the 10th Century. So byri is several times written for byrig.

The Preface.

to Almighty God, who liveth, and reigneth World without end. Amen.

The curious, who delight in such ancient Monuments, are beholden to the Reverend, and Learned Mr. *William Elstob* formerly fellow of *University-College, Oxon*, and now Rector of *St. Switben's, London*, for the translation of it; and I think my self obliged to give him publick thanks for his assistance in this, and * another greater Work.

From what I have written in answer to my anonymous Adversary, p. 188. I think my self under some obligation to speak my thoughts more freely of the most *Christian*, I am sure; and, I think, most effectual way of discouraging, and disappointing the diligence of the *Missioners*, and stopping the growth of Popery among us, which is still greater than formerly, notwithstanding the increase of Penal Laws. This I take to be a full supply of the want of Churches, and Parish Priests among us, with an honourable provision for the Clergy, whereof so many Thousands of the too small number live meanly, or miserably, to the great dishonour of God, whose *Ministers* they are, and the sin, and reproach of the Nation, which ought to provide better for the Servants of their Lord, and Saviour, who redeemed them with his Blood. For want of a sufficient number of Churches and Parish-Priests, and a sufficient Maintenance of them, the People of *England* in many places are as *Sheep without Shepherds*, wholly obnoxious to the Wolves, which haunt the places of prey, I mean the Parishes, that are either exorbitant for the number of Souls, or for their compass, and extent,

* See p. 98. *Dissertationis Epist. ad Barthol. Shower. in Antiquæ Literature Septentrionalis*, lib. 1.

The Preface.

or destitute of able Ministers to defend them, who being very poor, want not only Books, and other helps to the knowledge that is necessary for a Divine, but authority to defend their Flocks. In some places there is a deplorable concurrence of all, or more of these causes, and from one, or more of them it is, that Popery, and all other Sects have increased so much in this deplorable state of the Church. The first cause, which is the too great number of People in a Parish, is most observable in our great trading Cities, and most especially in this of *London*, under which I comprehend all the Parishes within the *Bills of Mortality*, where the Labourers are indeed too few, tho' the Harvest is very great. I live in a Parish where they reckon about Thirty Thousand People, according to which computation, if it be true, there must be about Five Thousand Families in it, which are more by Four Thousand Seven Hundred, than can be well known by one Man, or ought to be committed to the care of one Priest. In this Parish, to my certain knowledge, there are great numbers of Families, who neither know the Minister's Name, nor Person, nor where he dwells, and were it not for the parochial Officers, that go about, would not know in what Parish they live. It was in this Parish the young Gentlewoman lived, of whom I have given an account in this Preface. Her Father died in it not many Years since, firm in the Communion of the Church of *England*. Her Brother was traveling abroad at the time of his death, and was perverted in *France* to the Church of *Rome*; and being returned home perverted his Sister, which might have been prevented by the Minister, if in such a multitude, it had been possible for him to know

know
the w
miss
passio
Clerg
the M
this C
fectu
there
Popish
and t
noura
fectua
ply t
the F
a cha
Priest
ought
ken,
Morta
hundr
Priest
The
London
expire
of Ch
City,
numbe
Churc
ple of
doubt
those
I fa
maint
Priests
of ma
they f

The Preface.

know this *Lamb* of his Flock, and what danger she was in of the Wolf. I speak this with submission to our Superiours to move their Compassion to the Souls of the People, and hope the Clergy in Convocation will speedily represent the Miseries of the Church, which proceed from this Cause, and supplicate for timely, and effectual redress. For in these over-grown Parishes there are, I fear, ten, or it may be, twenty *Popish* for one Priest of the Church of *England*, and therefore no remedy can be found so honourable and proper against Popery, and so effectual against the encrease of it, as to multiply the number of Shepherds in proportion to the Flock. I think three hundred Families are a charge fully great enough for any Parish-Priest; according to which proportion there ought to be in the Parish, of which I have spoken, fifteen or sixteen, and within the Bills of Mortality, I cannot guess how many above an hundred new Churches, and as many Parish-Priests.

The *Coal-Act* for rebuilding the Churches in *London*, as I am informed, is now expiring, or expired. If that were continued for building of Churches in the vast *Out-Parishes* about the City, the Revenue of it would in the same number of Years build the same number of Churches, and in expectation of them, the People of the new parochial Divisions would undoubtedly be willing to erect Tabernacles, as those of *the City* did.

I say nothing here of the ways of raising maintenance for such a new number of *parochial Priests*, though I think there are more, than one, of making it easie to the People; who after they found the comfort, and benefit of living

The Preface.

in much less, but much more regular Parishes, where the Pastors, and their Flocks might be known to each other, they would cheerfully submit to such an Establishment for their maintenance, as publick Wisdom should enact. Nor will I say how much such a division of the great Parishes into many less would contribute to the publick civil Order, and Peace. For I need but suggest it to those, who have observed what great numbers of disorderly Houses there are in the over-grown Parishes, and what unknown harbours, and lurking places the *Rogues, and sturdy Beggars*, who infest all the quarters of the Town, find in them, as in so many great Woods. Which inconveniences, and mischiefs would be remedied in a great measure by a partition, or reduction of these greater and ungovernable, into less, and more governable Parishes, where not only the Manners of single Persons, but of Families would more easily be observed, and known.

The second Cause of the great growth of Popery, and other Sects, which is the exorbitant extent, and compass of Parishes, is most visible in the Country; and those who know the *Northern Counties, and Wales*, must needs be very sensible of the Mischiefs, and Misfortunes of the Church, that proceed from this Cause. In such Parishes tho' the number of Houses be not too great, yet the huge distance most of them often are at from the Parish-Church, and Minister, and he from them, makes it impossible for such remote Parishioners to receive the benefit, they otherwise would, from his Ministry, or for him to have the knowledge of what passes among them, or of the dangers their Families are in. In these vast Parishes the Sheep
are

are a
want
ever
or m
tinue
Chur
pass,
Th
Pope
the C
junct
ing,
exten
alien
fore
Chur
best a
remo
er, or
Tithe
of the
of Pe
them,
well
chase
tions,
free.
by th
pence
atone
for m
as nat
and b
restitu

† Wi
and Coll

The Preface.

are always obnoxious to the Wolves, and apt to wander from the fold; and to cure this evil, every such Parish is to be divided into two or more, according to its bigness; or if it continue as one Parish, it ought to have more Churches, and Priests in proportion to its compass, and extent.

The third manifest Cause of the growth of Popery, which proceeds from the *Poverty of the Clergy*, is most commonly found in conjunction with the second, they, generally speaking, in the Country being the Parishes of great extent, and compass, where the Tythes are alienated from the Church. I shall not therefore particularly insist upon this Cause of the Churches great misfortunes, but propose the best and most blessed Remedy I know for the removal of it, wheresoever it is found in greater, or lesser Parishes, and that is restoring the Tithes to the parochial Priests. The purchase of them by the Nation would be easie in times of Peace, and Plenty; but by the purchase of them, I mean the purchase of † *appropriated*, as well as *impropriated* Tithes, and also the purchase of them where Lands by *Papal Exemptions, Moduses*, or other Causes are now *Tithe-free*. The benefit our Country would receive by this purchase, would be an ample recompence for the cost. For first it would make an atonement for the Sacrilege of the Nation, which for many Years hath been the *judicial*, as well as *natural* Cause of many and great Evils to it, and by consequence the happy effects of such a restitution would be returned in numerous bles-

† With the purchase-Money of which, *Colleges, Hospitals, and Collegiate Churches* should be obliged to buy Lands.

The Preface.

sings to the State, as well as to the Church. Secondly, the Tithes so purchased, and restored would be a worthy Fund of Maintenance for the Children of the People, who contribute to the purchase of them; for the Clergy are the Sons of the Laity, their own Flesh, and Blood, and therefore in purchasing the Tithes they purchase for their own Families, and make good provision thereby for their Sons, and Sons and Daughters Sons for ever. And whereas now there are but about ten thousand Parish-Priests, whereof at least two thirds live meanly, or miserably, there will then, in all appearance, be a competent maintenance for double the number, which God, and the Necessities of the Church seem to require. Thirdly, The Church being thus furnished with a sufficient number of parochial Priests, and Cures, the People will not so easily be led astray, nor Wolves of any Sect, especially of the *Popish*, have such convenient opportunities of devouring the Flock. On the contrary, when the Church is so well provided in all places with parochial Priests, she will soon be in a condition to reduce the stray Sheep to her fold, and to *reprise* upon the Emissaries of all sorts, particularly those of the Romish Church, by converting Papists in all places, where they most abound. Fourthly, Out of the first Fruits of the Tithes so established and restored, and the tenths of them, a competent maintenance may be found for more *Diocesan* Bishops, as well as more Parish Priests. I mean more *Diocesan* Bishops *without Baronies*, of which there is as great need, as of more Parish Priests. Could I see these things done, Patronage of Ecclesiastical Livings reformed, and regulated as a *pure trust*, and secured from Simoniackal

mon
peni
ling
Reve
Prop
and
own
now
mine
I am
such
long
his C
Spiri
Princ
may
ever

Th
them
a Chr
and v
nothi
fort o
be an
hate
call t
spitef
Edific
Fami
Confo
it fill
dicatu
no oth
only
to the
suaded
confid

The Preface.

moniacal Contracts (which is easie to be done) penitential Canons with an Office for reconciling Penitents made in Convocation, and the Reverend Dr. Prideaux the Dean of Norwich's Proposal enacted for incorporating the Bishop, and Clergy of every Diocess to provide for their own Poor, I should then say with joy, *Lord, now lettest thou thy Servant depart in peace, for mine Eyes have seen thy Salvation.* But since I am too far advanced in Years to hope to see such an happy change, I will pray for it, as long as I live, trusting that God in Mercy to his Church will in his good time pour out a Spirit of Reformation upon the Priests, and Princes, and People of this Land, that they may all agree to perfect, and amend whatsoever is wanting, or amiss in the Church.

This is the Scheme, which I humbly offer to them, as the best I know, and most becoming a Christian State, for the suppression of Popery, and with it all other Sects among us. There is nothing in it, that I know can justly offend any sort of Men, but *Atheists* and *Deists*; or if there be any other sort of Enemies to Christ, who hate a Priest, as such, and dare blasphemously call the *divine Institution* of Priesthood, by the spiteful name of *Priestcraft*. It is a Scheme of *Edification*, and not of *Destruction* to Men, or Families. It is consistent with entire liberty of Conscience, it hurts no Man's Person, or Estate; it fills no Jails with Prisoners, or Courts of Judicature with bloody Criminal Trials, and needs no other assistance from the Secular Powers, but only not to encourage those, who are Enemies to the Church. The blessing of God, I am persuaded, would go along with it, and in this confidence of his blessing I have proposed it, as

The Preface.

it were on a *Table* exposed to publick view. I hope all Men will accept my good intentions, however they may dislike what I have proposed, and if our Superiours think I have taken too much liberty, as a private Person, I hope in a time of so much freedom used by all sorts of Men, and abused by too many, they will the more easily pardon their humble Servant, and most hearty well-wisher to his Country,

GEORGE HICKES.

*The following Extract of the Opinion of the
Greeks about the Pope's Supremacy, and the
Notion they have of the Catholick Church
was sent to me by the Reverend, and Learn-
ed Mr. Edm. Chishull, Fellow of E. C. C.
Oxford, too late to be inserted in its pro-
per place. But rather than the Curious, and
Learned Readers should want the benefit of
it, I thought it would be acceptable to them
to print it here. And I think fit to acquaint
them for the Honour of that worthy Gentle-
man, that he had communicated these, and
other authorities sooner to me, had I had the
happinefs to be sooner acquainted with him.*

*For the Reverend Dr. Hickes, at his House in
Ormond-Street.*

Reverend Sir,

*" Since I had the honour of waiting on you,
" I have been obliged to be out of Town;
" but being now return'd, I remember my pro-
" mise of transmitting to you the Opinion of
" the Greeks concerning the Primacy of the
" Pope, and the Universality of the Church,
" Those which I have transcribed into the
" enclosed Paper, are very exprefs and very
" authentick; and will therefore, I hope, come
" up to your expectations. But if you desire far-
" ther to consult their particular enlargements
" upon these Subjects, be pleas'd in this or any
" other matter to lay your Commands upon*

Your oblig'd humble Se:vant,

Edm. Chishull,

The inclosed Paper.

IN the Confession of the Faith of the Greek Church, compil'd by a Synod at *Jassy* in *Moldavia*, and confirm'd by another at *Constantinople* in the presence of all the four Patriarchs, we have these words, in answer to this Question, "What is secondly implied by our professing to believe in the Holy Catholick Church?"

Ὅτι παρ' ἐδενδός τοῦ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία εἴληφε τὸ νομα. Αἱ γὰρ τοπικαὶ μερικαὶ εἰσιν, ὅς ἢ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, ἢ ἐν Ἀφίῳ-χίᾳ, ἢ ἐν Ἱερουσολύμοις, ἢ ἐν Ρώμῃ, ἢ ἐν Ἀλιζαμδρείᾳ, καὶ αἱ λοιπαί, &c.

Vide ὁρθόδοξον ὁμολογίαν, printed in *Valachia*, Anno 1699. p. 109.

Against the Primacy and Supremacy of the Pope, there are various Tracts in my Collection of this sort. But for a Specimen of their Opinion in this matter, take the following words of the present Patriarch of *Jerusalem*, in his Preface to his Edition of the Τόμ. ἀγάπης.

Μήτε ὁ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, μήτε οἱ λοιποὶ πατριαρχαί, μήτε ἄλλοι τις ὁρθόδοξος ἐφένησε ποτὲ τι ἔχει ἡ ἐκκλησία Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐν τῇ καθόλου ἐκκλησίᾳ μοναρχικόν, ἢ αυτοκρατορικόν, ἢ γενικόν ἀξίωμα, ἀλλ' ἐστὶ κεφαλὴ πρωτόδικα καὶ μόνη καὶ τάξις, ὅπερ καὶ αὐτὸ μέγα τι εἶναι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. Εἴσα φρονέτω ὁ πατριάρχης ὅτι ὁν τρέπον ἡ ἀνατολικὴ ἐκκλησία λέγει καὶ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως πρῶτον καὶ κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ τὸ τρέπον αὐτόν, ὅτι καὶ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος Ρώμης πρῶτος καὶ κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ δευτέρου καὶ Ρώμης πρῶτον (ἔ) καὶ κεφαλὴ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. Ἀλλ' εἰ ὡς δεχόμενοι τὸ τοῦτο, ἀρα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰ ὡς δεχόμενοι καὶ Ρώμης ἔτε πρῶτον, ἔτε κεφαλὴ, ἔτε μὲν διοικῶν ἐπίσκοπον ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.

In another Tome published by the same Patriarch, under the Title of Τόμ. καθ' ἡμῶν these are the Summaries of particular Chapters.

Ὅτι ἐμόνον ὁ τὸ πρεσβυτέρους Ρώμης θρόνος ἀποστολικὸς καλεῖται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἕκαστος τῶν ἄλλων πατριαρχικῶν θρόνων.

Ὅτι μία καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία, ἔχει ἡ τὸ πρεσβυτέρους Ρώμης λέγει, ἀλλ' ἡ τὸ οἰκουμενικὴ πάσης τῆς ὁρθοδόξης.

THE CONTENTS.

THE Query sent to Dr. Hickes by a Popish
Missioner, Page 1
Dr. Hickes's Answer to the Query, p. 2
The Missioner's Reply to the Doctor's Answer, p. 14

Dr. Hickes's Answer to the Missioner's Reply in
X Chapters.

CHAP. I.

The Doctor's Reason given for transcribing the
Query, p. 25
The alledg'd mistake of the word HOLY for RO-
MAN justified, p. 26.
The other pretended mistake, of INFALLIBILITY
for INDEFECTIBILITY, cleared, p. 27
A Church may be a True Catholick Apostolick
Church, tho' it had not its being from the first
Foundation of Christianity, p. 32

CHAP. II.

The Missioner's trifling defence, for disingenuously
sending a manifold Query under the name of
one in Terms of uncertain signification consider'd,
p. 34
The

The Contents.

<i>The Antiquated Question, Where was the Protestant Church before Luther? answered,</i>	p. 43
<i>The Missioner's undecent Reflexions upon A. B. Cranmer retorted upon one of the Popes,</i>	p. 44
<i>Returning Queries to Queries no new way of answering,</i>	p. 46
<i>Divine Worship paid to a material Cross by the Papists,</i>	p. 47
<i>The Missioner's fallacious Challenge,</i>	p. 53
<i>The Challenge rightly stated,</i>	p. 55
<i>Preliminaries propos'd in order to the Controversie,</i>	p. 55

CHAP. III.

<i>That the Reformed Church of England professeth the same Faith or Religion, which the whole Catholick Church (that of Rome not excepted) professed a Thousand Years ago, prov'd from Councils, ancient Writers, &c.</i>	p. 58
<i>The Lord's Prayer a Rule for Prayer, and the Apostles Creed a Rule of Faith to be learned by Catechumens in the vulgar Tongue,</i>	p. 63
<i>The same Faith or Religion pure, and entire without foreign mixtures or additions to the end of the viii Century, which the Church of England now professeth,</i>	p. 64
<i>The first Confession of Faith with new additions in the second Council of Nice, Anno Dom. 787,</i>	ibid.
<i>The Decrees of that Council condemned, Anno 794,</i>	p. 66
<i>By another Council held at Constantino-ple, Anno 814,</i>	ibid.

---And

The Contents.

- *And by a Synod at Paris, Anno 825, ibid.*
How the Church of England agreed then with the
German and Gallican Churches, p. 67
The Church of England the same now as then,
 p. 68
The distinction of Veneratio, from Cultus and In-
vocatio, p. 69
The Faith or Religion which the Church of England
now professeth agrees with Pope Gregory the
Great's Confessions both before and after his Con-
secration, p. 70, 71, 72, &c.

CHAP. IV.

- What is there meant by the word PERISH,* p. 75, 76
The distinction between a True or Real, and a Sound
Church, p. 79
In what sense a Church may properly be said to
PERISH, p. 83

CHAP. V.

- The word CHURCH used in Scripture in a larger*
and a narrower sense, it sometimes signifies the
whole, sometimes part of the Catholick Church,
 p. 85
Used in the same sense by Old Ecclesiastical Wri-
ters, p. 86
The Roman Church but a part of the Catholick
Church, p. 98
The acceptation of the word CHURCH in the larger
general sense for the Church of Rome only, ab-
surd and contrary to that Article, I believe the
Holy Catholick Church, p. 99
The Church of Rome taken only for a particular
Church both by the Ancient Greek and Latin
Writers. p. 102
 CHAP.

The Contents.

CHAP. VI.

- The words Church, Church of Christ, Catholick Church, often used to signifie a part of the Universal Church,* p. 113
The Church of Rome may perish, and yet the Catholick Church be preserved, p. 120
By the word CHURCH to be understood the Faith, Worship and Polity of the Church, p. 130

CHAP. VII.

- Dr. Hickes's farther Vindication of his Answer to the Missioner's Challenge, Name your Bishops, Writers, &c. 900 or 1000 Years before the Separation,* p. 135
The difference shewn between a Church morally and metaphysically True, p. 139
Idolatrous Worship proved upon the Roman Church, p. 145
The Sin of Idolatry does not destroy the Being of a Christian, p. 147
An Idolatrous Church may become a pure and morally Holy Church upon Repentance, and Reformation, p. 150
The Doctor's Charity for the Church of Rome, p. 152

CHAP. VIII.

- The Church of Rome no Visible Church of Christ, i. e. of faithful Men, where the Sacraments are duly administred,* p. 152
Allow'd to be a Real (tho' an Impure) Church, p. 160

The

The Contents.

The Church of England no new (but a renew'd and reform'd) Religion, p. 161

CHAP. IX.

The promise of Indefeetibility falsly arrogated to the Roman Church, p. 163

Several other Churches have visibly continu'd (tho' not always flourish'd) from their Foundation to this present day, p. 170

Our Ancestors 900 Tears ago had no such occasion as we, to protest against Popish Innovations, p. 171

Our Faith the same it was 900 or 1000 Tears before Luther, *ibid.*

The Council of Trent a pack'd Council, neither Free nor General, p. 172

The Church of England defended from the Charge of Heresie, p. 174

Multitude no Argument for Universality in the Roman Church, p. 180

Christ the only Head, under which the whole Body of the Catholick Church is united, p. 176

CHAP. X.

The Doctor's repeated Challenge to the Missioners to shew the Antiquity, Universality or Succession for the Trent Doctrines during the first five, or six Centuries, p. 188

Some Letters which passed between the Missioner and Dr. Hickes, before the Doctor sent him an Answer to his Reply, p. 192

The Missioner's Letter with this Query, By what Lineage do you make your Descent good from

The Contents.

from the 4th Century to the pretended Reformation,	<i>ibid.</i>
<i>The Doctor's Answer,</i>	p. 198
<i>The Query turn'd upon the Missioner,</i>	p. 200
<i>The Missioner's Reply to the Doctor's Answer,</i>	p. 204
<i>The Character of COCCIUS, to whom he refers the Doctor, in the Margin,</i>	p. 208
<i>The Answer written to the Missioner's Reply by one of the Doctor's Friends,</i>	p. 211
<i>A Letter of Monsieur de Meaux to Robert Nelson, Esq; in French,</i>	p. 227
——— <i>Translated into English,</i>	p. 229
<i>Dr. Bull's Answer to that Letter,</i>	Section I. p. 232
<i>The Roman Church and the Catholick Church, not convertible Terms,</i>	p. 233
<i>The great danger of their Salvation, who live in Communion with the Church of Rome,</i>	p. 235
<i>The infallible assistance of the Holy Ghost in the Council of Nice, or any other truly General Council, no Argument for Communion with the Church of Rome.</i>	<i>ibid.</i>
<i>The Doctor's Answer to the Bishop's Question, What is meant by the Catholick Church?</i>	p. 237
<i>The Corruptions of the Church of Rome detected,</i>	Sect. II.
——— <i>In Government,</i>	p. 240
——— <i>In the Rule of Faith,</i>	Sect. III. p. 244
<i>The Reverend Mr. Lesley's Letter to the aforesaid Bishop's Letter.</i>	
<i>What is to be meant by the Catholick Church,</i>	p. 305
<i>The Government of the Church committed to Bishops, who were distinguished by the Titles of Diocesan</i>	

The Contents.

<i>Diocesan Bishops, Metropolitans, Primates and Patriarchs,</i>	p. 306
<i>From whence the Council of Bishops in the Empire were stiled Oecumenical,</i>	p. 307
<i>The Patriarch of Constantinople claimed the Primacy upon the Seat of the Empire's being translated thither from Rome.</i>	ibid.
<i>An Universal Primacy disclaimed, and protested against by Pope Gregory the Great, Bishop of Rome,</i>	p. 308
<i>The Pope's Supremacy limited by the Gallican Church,</i>	p. 309
<i>That limitation disputed,</i>	ibid.
<i>Reason for disowning the Pope's Supremacy,</i>	ibid.
<i>The same Reasons might be urged for an Universal Monarch, as for an Universal Bishop,</i>	p. 315
<i>His Answer to the Bishops Question, How several Churches can be that Kingdom of Christ not divided in it self, and which can never fail?</i>	p. 316
<i>The Schism of such as have broke off from subjection to their lawful Bishops, justly charged upon the Pope's pretended Sovereignty,</i>	p. 320
<i>Every Bishop in his own Diocess may condemn an Heresie, but no Council of Bishops can alter any Fundamental Article of Faith,</i>	p. 324
<i>The Dispute not yet determined where the Infallibility is placed,</i>	p. 325
<i>A Letter to an English Priest of the Roman Communion at Rome, from Robert Nelson, Esq;</i>	
<i>His Opinion of a pretended Miracle,</i>	p. 328
<i>Infallibility has no foundation either in Holy Scripture, or primitive Antiquity,</i>	p. 331

The

The Contents.

*The Holy Scriptures and Fathers aspersed by some
of the Romish Writers,* p. 333, 334

APPENDIX.

- Mr. Herbert Thorndike's Judgment of the Church
of Rome,* Paper I.
*Mr. Chillingworth's Letter of the Infallibility of
the Church of Rome,* Pap. II.
The Creed of Pope Pius IV. Pap. III.
*Bp. Cosin's Letter to the late Countess of Peter-
borough, concerning the difference in the chief
points of Religion between the Church of Rome
and the Church of England,* Pap. IV.
*A publick Office of daily Devotion for the seven
canonical Hours used in the time of the Saxons,
with a Translation and Notes of the Reverend
Mr. Elstob.*

ERRATA.

PAGE 6. Line 11. r. affordeth. p. 36. l. 21. r. ambiguous.
p. 50. l. 18. r. Paragraph. p. 58. l. 11. r. premised. p. 114.
l. 2. r. Presbytery. p. 151. l. 7. r. Whore. p. 192. l. 4.
r. Meaux.

Part of Mr. ----n's LETTER
beginning with the following
Query sent to Dr. George
Hickes, by a Gentleman late-
ly perverted from the Church
of England, to the Church
of Rome.

SUPPOSING this for true, That the Church
of Christ can never perish, I desire to know
(if the Protestant Church be the true
One) where it was for many hundreds of Years
before Luther? Name your Bishops, Writers,
Churches, nay one single Congregation, or Vil-
lage of Protestants, for 900 or 1000 Years,
before your Separation from the holy Catholick
Church.

THE Gentleman, Sir, I spoke to you of the last
time I had the honour of waiting on you, being
to quit the Town in a very short time, is willing
to delay no longer out Business in hand; in order
to which proceeding, I here send you, as from
him, the above-written Query, &c.

February 28. 1701.

B

Dr.

Dr. Hickes's ANSWER to the foregoing Query. In a Letter to Mr. — n.

S I R,

March 4. 1702.

LAST Wednesday, being *Asb-Wednesday*, in the Afternoon, I receiv'd a few Lines from you under the name of a *Query*, containing a *Supposition*, a *Question*, and a *Challenge*; which, you say, you sent me from the Gentleman you lately spoke of to me, and who you then told me was a Priest, and by consequence, one of your Guides. Had you not told me you sent them from a Man of his Character, who was appointed by his Superior to manage the Controversie that is between your Church and Ours, I should rather have thought they had been penn'd by some *Novitiate*, or late Convert, who was not skill'd in Controversie; First, Because they are, as I conceive, nothing to the purpose of the *Infallibility of the Church*, the Subject in which, at your desire, we are to be engag'd. And Secondly, Because they are unaccurately penn'd in terms of uncertain Signification, and take the main thing for granted, which is in dispute between our Church and yours. The Supposition is penn'd in these Words; *Supposing this for true, that the Church of Christ can never perish*. Where I desire to know, What the Gentleman means by *perish*? And, Secondly, What he means by *the Church of Christ*? For *perish* may signifie, that the Church can be quite destroy'd, so as to have no manner of Being in the World, as it had not, before it first began to be; or, Secondly, It may signifie only not to be the same Church, as to *Doctrine, Worship, and Polity*,

* I have the foregoing

Polity, which was founded by Christ, and finish'd by the Apostles, but to be corrupted and deprav'd more or less, in one, or more, or all those Parts of its Constitution. In the former acceptation of the Word, *perish* signifies to cease to be at all, or to have Existence in a *Metaphysical Sense*, as Cities and Colleges do, when they are disfranchised, or disincorporated; or as Kingdoms, when they are absolutely destroyed and turned into Democracies, or Commonwealths. But in the latter sense, it means no more than that the Church ceases to be a sound, rightly constituted, or Apostolical Church in one, or more Parts of its Constitution; so that a *Catholick Christian cannot communicate in it without Sin*; and this is to *perish*, or be depraved from what it was, and ought to be, in a *moral Sense*. Secondly, The Church of Christ may be taken in as large a sense, as *Christianity*, for the whole Universal Church, wheresoever dispersed over the Earth, or for some part of it greater, or less, comprehending one, or more Churches, but not the Universal Church. And when the Gentleman will tell me in which sense he means the Words *never perish*, and in which sense he understands the *Church of Christ*, then I will tell him in which sense I think his Supposition true, and in which I think it is not: * [For I have reason to think that by the *Church of Christ* he only means the *Church of Rome*.]

AFTER his Supposition follows a Question, in these Words: *I desire to know (if the Protestant Church be the true one) where it was many hundreds of Years before Luther?* This, Sir, is not

* I have added this to shew the reason, why I made use of the foregoing distinction.

one, but two Questions, which an accurate Adversary would have rather proposed thus; *I desire to know if the Protestant Church be the true Church?* If so, then *I desire to know where it was many hundreds of Years before Luther?* Here again I must desire to know, before I answer the first Question, what he means by the *Protestant Church?* For there are many *Protestant Churches*, so call'd, whereof some are true, and some are not true Churches; some perfect, and some not perfect Churches; and when he is pleased to let me know what *Protestant Church* he means, then I shall know how to return an Answer. Secondly, As to the phrase *Protestant Church*, it may either signifie the Clergy and People of the Church, or the Faith, or Worship, and Polity, and whatsoever else belongs to the Constitution of a Church; and when he is pleased to let me know, that by the *Protestant Church* he particularly means the Faith, Worship, and Polity of the Church of *England*, and not the Succession of Clergy, and People teaching and professing that Faith, practising that Worship, and formed into that Polity; then I will tell him where the Church of *England* was many hundreds of Years before *Luther*; or, if he pleases; before the Council of *Trent*, even where the present Faith, Worship, and Polity of the *Roman Church* never was, *i. e. in the Primitive Church*. I say, before the Council of *Trent*, because *Luther* was none of our Reformers, and because I should rather have expected, that a fair and learned Adversary should have said, *I desire to know, where the Church of England, or where your Religion was for many hundreds of Years before the Reformation, or pretended Reformation*, as he might have said without offence. But the Question thus put, hath been

so often, and so plainly, and fully answer'd, that he must pardon me, if I say I am tempted to think, he purposely disguised it in other uncertain, and ambiguous terms.

IN the last place comes his Challenge in these Words: *Name your Bishops, Writers, Churches, nay one single Congregation, or Village of Protestants for 900 or 1000 Years before your Separation from the holy Catholick Church.*

HERE it is, as I observ'd, that the Gentleman begs the Question, or takes for granted what is the greatest Point of Controversie between us, in those Words, *Your Separation from the holy Catholick Church*; whereas we affirm, and most assuredly believe, that our Separation (as he must mean from the Church of Rome) was not a Separation from the holy Catholick Church, but a return unto it from many Errors, Innovations, Abuses, and Corruptions; and whether it were so or no, we are willing to appeal to Catholick Tradition, which consists in *Antiquity, Universality, and Consent.*

2dly, HIS Challenge is fallacious and sophistical, in asking us to *Name our Bishops, Writers, Churches, &c. i. e. our Reform'd Bishops, Writers, and Churches*, before the Reformation, which he calls our Separation; that is to say, he asks us to name our reform'd Bishops, Writers, and Churches, before they were reform'd; which is as absurd as to ask us to shew the alteration and change of any other Society or Thing, before it was altered and changed.

SIR, in this way of Challenging, he might as well have bid us name our Protestant Kings and Courts before *Edward VI.* And any Man may as reasonably ask a Sloven, where his clean Face was, for so many Days, before it was washed?

Sir, would you not think a Man went to impose upon you, who should ask you, *Where your sound and healthful Constitution after Recovery was all the while you lay sick?* Or of a River, which perhaps in your Ancestor's Days was full of Mud and Weeds, but you had cleansed with great Cost and Labour, *Where the pure and clean Stream of it was all the while it was foul?* Would you not think he banter'd you, to bid you shew him one Tun or Hogs-head, or but one single Bucket of such Water, as it now afforded, for I know not how many Years, before it was made clean? Sir, I have brought these familiar Similitudes to shew you, what a fallacious Challenge the Gentleman hath sent me by you, and how he hath endeavour'd to impose upon you, and me in the terms of it. Had it been fairly penn'd, it should have been put in these or the like Words: *Name any Bishops, Writers, Churches, nay one single Congregation or Village of Christians, that professed your Religion for 900 or 1000 Years before your Separation from the Church of Rome;* and if he pleases to put it so, I will give it an Answer; and then desire him to name one Church, Bishop, or Writer, that 900 or 1000 Years ago professed the *Tridentine Faith*, * [or the Creed of Pope Pius IV.].

I say, if he will make his Challenge in those or the like terms, I will accept and answer it; but at present it is sufficient to shew the Fallacy of it, as he wrote, or dictated it to you. In truth, Sir, it is the same Fallacy, that is in the following Syllogism, with which young Sophisters in the Schools endeavour to puzzle one anothers Wits.

* I have added these Words, because I intend to print that Creed in *English*.

You bought raw Flesh,

You eat the Flesh which you bought,

Therefore

You eat raw Flesh.

SIR, would you not think I was merry, and ludicrous, and not at all serious, if I should make such a Syllogism, or ask you, *Where your roast or boiled Meats was all the while it was raw?* Thus much, Sir, in reference to the *Supposition, Question, and Challenge*, which the Gentleman sent me by you, and which, I told you before, were nothing to the *Church's Infallibility*, which was to be the Subject of Controversie between us. I confess the *Supposition* relates to the *Indefeasibility* of the Church; but neither that, nor any thing else in his Query, as he improperly calls it, relates to the *Infallibility of the Church*. And therefore in requital to his Query, which was nothing to that Subject, I take the liberty to send him some, that are,

I. SEEING the Word *Church* hath* many significations, I desire to know of him the particular limited

* See all these Significations in the following Citation out of the *Confutatio Imperii Papæ in Ecclesiam*, by Nestarius, Patriarch of Hierusalem; publish'd by the Learned Dr. Alix. in Latin MDCCII. p. 212.

The Word [*Church*] therefore is taken in two senses; First, Personally, as every Assembly of Men about any common Business or Affair. Secondly, Locally, and such are the Places in which we assemble, i. e. Temples, Forums, Theatres and Courts. It is taken for a Temple, 1 Cor. chap. 11. *Have ye not houses to eat and to drink in, or despise ye the Church of God?*

limited sense in which it is infallible, or in which of the many senses Infallibility belongs to it?

II. I desire to know, if by the Church's Infallibility, he means that the Church hath always a living infallible Judge; if so, then,

III. I

And chap. 14. *Let women be silent in the Churches; it is a shame for women to speak in the Church; let them ask their husbands at home.* But both these significations, as well Personal as Local, are of two sorts, Civil and Spiritual. I. Civil, such, absolutely speaking, is every concourse or company of People, as was that of *Ephesus*, which rushed upon *Gaius* and *Aristarchus*, Paul's companions; the Town-clerk is said to have dismiss'd that Church or Assembly: Or else the Place it self, as the Forum or Court, where they met. II. Spiritually, and then it signifies an Assembly either lawful or unlawful. Unlawful, indeed, are such as are called by the Canons sinful and schismatical Assemblies, according to that of the Psalmist, *I have hated the congregation of the ungodly.* But the lawful, of which I am going to speak gradually, is First, either of a few in an House, as *salute the Church in their House*, Rom. 16. Or, 2dly, Of many Houses in one Territory, as *praise God in the Churches*; and, 1 Cor. 14. *Who speaks in an unknown tongue edifyeth himself; but he who prophesieth edifieth the Church.* Or, 3dly, Of many Territories into one Bishoprick, as, *The Church of God which is at Corinth*, (1 Cor. 1.) And in the first of the Revelation, *To the seven Churches which are in Asia.* Or, 4thly, It signifies the People or Flock without the Bishop, as in your Citations; *Take heed therefore unto your selves, and unto all the flock whereof the Holy Ghost has made you Bishops, to feed the Church of God*, Acts 20. and, 2 Cor. 11. *I have robbed other Churches, taking wages.* 5thly, It signifies the Bishops and Presbyters, as in a Synod or Council, mentioned also by you, as in S. Matth. c. 18, *Tell the Church; but if he hears not the Church, let him be unto you as an Heathen.* 6thly, The Chief of the Clergy and Laity, as in your Citation, Acts 16. *They being brought on their way by the Church, pass'd over into Phœnicia.* And again, Acts 18. *Going down to Caesarea, he went up and saluted the Church.* 7thly, It signifies the Churches of many Episcopal Cities under one Metropolis, as Can. 4. Synod. 1. *The Confirmation of those things which are done in the Province, (speaking about the Election of a Bishop) belongs to the Metropolitan; and the whole Province*

III. I would know, whether this infallible Judge be a single infallible Person, or an infallible Senate, or Council?

IV. IF it be a single infallible Person, I desire to know, where he is always to be found, or where his infallible Chair is? 2dly, Under what Character

vince is said to be one Church. 8thly, It is taken for many Metropolitical Churches united under one Primate or Exarch, as Can. 34. of the holy Apostles, *It is convenient the Bishops of several Countries should know who amongst them is Chief, not that he should do any thing without acquainting them all.* And Can. 9. and 17. of the 4th Council, *If any one is unjustly sentenced by the Metropolitan, or has a Controversie with him, let him appeal to the Exarch, or to the See of CP.* But the Exarchs are such as the Bishops of Ephesus in Asia, of Casarea in the East, of Heraclia in Thrace, of Thessalonica in Macedonia, of Corinth in Peloponnesus. 9thly, It is used to signifie many National Churches under one which from the time of the first General Council, were Five in number; (whereas before they were but Three, and Four before the taking and destruction of Jerusalem) and those Five were establish'd by the following Councils. The 6th Can. of the first Council, says, *Let ancient Customes be observ'd. Let the Patriarch of Alexandria have the Authority of all those that are in Egypt, Lybia and Pentapolis, because like usage is observ'd also to the Roman Bishop.* So likewise are the Privileges preserved to the Churches in Antioch, and other Provinces. And that the Bishop of Ælia (or Jerusalem) be honoured according to the Tradition of the Ancients, is determined in the 7th Canon. In the 10th place, The Church is taken for a Synod of these five Patriarchs, in whom the whole Hierarchy is comprehended as in one union and indissoluble Communion among themselves, both as to the Faith, and Profession, and Sacraments, and Spiritual Officers, and as much as may be, in respect of Manners, and form of Government. Of this it is said, *Upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.* And in the 5th to the Ephes. St. Paul says, *The man is the head of the woman, as Christ is the head of the Church. Husbands love your wives, as Christ loveth the Church.* And in 1 Cor. 12. *And has placed them indeed in the Church, first Apostles, secondly Prophets, thirdly Doctors:* And this is properly stiled *The Catholick Church;* or, absolutely speaking, *The Church of God,*

Character or Capacity this Infallibility belongs to him? And, 3^{dly}, If he happen to be a secret Atheist, or Heretick, or Simonist, or Sorcerer, much more if he be openly any of these, whether in these cases he still continues Infallible? But if this infallible Judge be a Senate, or Council, then,

V. I would know, if it must be a Council of the Universal Church? If so, then,

VI. I would know of him, 1st, Who hath power to call this Council? 2^{dly}, Who hath power to preside in it? Or if these Privileges belong to one and the same Person by Christ's appointment? If so, then,

God, the Mother of us all, Christ's perfect Spouse, whose Head Christ is, according to the Apostle, in his Epistle to the Ephes. in the 1, 2, 5 chapters; and also Col. 1. Christ is also the only Head, according to Basil the Great, in his Sermon of the Judgment of God; who after the first Page, considering the Apostle's expression, speaks thus; *Ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular*; that is to say, in Him governing and joining every one to the others unto agreement in one, and one only true Head, which is Christ. In the 11th place, the Church is taken by a Synecdoche for any part relating to the whole Church, as in many of your instances; so the Apostle writing to the Corinthians, acknowledges, that he persecuted the Church of God; meaning especially the two Churches of Jerusalem and Damascus, because he had raised Troubles in them only, yet intentionally against the whole Catholick Church. And because all the Members being knit together amongst themselves, the whole Body is justly said to share in the suffering of its several Parts, according to that of the Apostle; *If one member suffer, all the members suffer with it: If one member rejoice, all the members rejoice with it.* Such another place is that in the first to Timothy the 3^d chap. *I write to thee, O Timothy, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thy self in the Church of God, which is the Church of the living God, the Pillar and Ground of Truth.* Now Timothy at that time conversed only in the Church of Ephesus, yet his pious Conversation edified the whole Church,

VII. I would know, whether that Council cannot be an infallible Judge, without the Call and Presidency of that Person? If so, then,

VIII. I would know of him, if it should so happen, that the whole Council, or the great majority of it should determine one way, and he alone, or but with a little minority another, which would be in the right?

SIR, I could ask many more important Questions relating to this Subject of the Church's Infallibility; as 1st, Whether the same spiritual Judges, if the matter in Controversie were sent to them in Circular Letters, would not be as Infallible in their Determinations, out of a Council, as in one? 2^{dly}, Whether the resolutions of those who cannot come, but send their Opinions upon the Question in Controversie to the Council, ought not to be regarded in every respect, as if they were present? Sir, There are many more difficult Questions relating to this Subject, but I will but trouble him with one, or two more, occasion'd by the writings of a learned Father of great authority in the Latin Church, I mean *Vincentius Lirinensis*, in his Book entituled *Commonitoria duo adversus profanas Hareses & Novationes*. He flourished in the Year of God 434. almost Thirteen hundred Years since. And the design of his Book [in those times] was to shew a certain way to determine all Controversies about Faith, which [in his judgment] was * *The Authority of Scripture, and the Tradition of the Catholick Church*, which he makes to consist in || *Antiquity, Universality, and Consent*.

* Cap. I. || Cap. III. XXXVII. XXXVIII. XXXIX. XLII.

THIS he proposes both to private Men, and Councils, as the only *sure* way of coming to truth in all Controversies of Faith † *without doubt or scruple*. He, nor the Fathers who wrote ‡ *before him*, ever so much as mention, much less direct, to any living infallible Judge; but to Scripture expounded by *Antiquity, Universality, and Consent*; and therefore I desire the Gentleman, upon reading that little Book, to tell me, if the Church knew of any living infallible Judge in his Time, or if it did, how he came to be ignorant of it? Or if, as he writes in that Book, Scripture expounded by Catholick Tradition, be a sure and certain Rule whereby to determine all Controversies, then how can there be any need of an infallible living Judge?

TO Catholick Tradition, as set forth and explained by him, we appeal, *viz.* to *Antiquity, Universality, and Consent*.

I appeal to it in this very Controversie of the *Church's Infallibility*, and will be concluded by it. And from this Rule, we shall see whether our Church or yours is *Innovator* in the things, that are in Controversie between them, and which is in the right, and which in the wrong. I join with you in your Prayer, 'That God would strengthen, and assist those with his Holy Spirit who plead his Cause, and bring those to Confusion, who fight against him with subtilty, and sophistry.'

I desire, Sir, that your *Sister* may have the deliberate perusal of this Letter by her self, as long, and as often as she thinks fit. And if the Gentleman hath a mind to proceed farther upon the subject of Infallibility, I desire it may be in an Oral Conference before your *Sister*, you only be-

† *Cap. XXXIX. XLI.*

‡ *As Tertullian Irenæus.*

ing present on one side, and my very worthy Friend, and Neighbour Mr. *Nelson*, whom you know, on the other. I find I am not able to write so much as a Paper Controversie upon this Question will require, having, as the World knows, much Work of another nature to do. This is the reason that I desire what you first proposed, that if the Gentleman think fit to go on, it may be in an Oral Conference, in some place where we may have proper Books.

YOU pretend, Sir, to be very much in haste for fear your *Sister* should die; she is, God be praised, very well; and such Conferences must not be huddled up in haste for that reason, no more than in former Ages they were wont to precipitate the Instruction of the *Catechumens*. *De vita hominis, nulla est Cunctatio longa*. I am,

SIR,

Your humble Servant,

GEO. HICKES.

The

*The REPLY to Dr. Hickes's Answer,
sent by the Author of it to Mr. —n,
and transmitted by Mr. —n to the
Doctor.*

S I R,

March 13. 1703.

I WHEN at your entreaty I sent you a *short* Query, concerning the true Church of Christ, to be proposed to a learned Doctor for an Answer; I could not have imagined that there had been in it, either so much ambiguity as to render it incapable of an Answer, or much less any thing to provoke any Man to *Passion and injurious Language*; but such has been the fate of that little Paper. As to the ill Language, it is by me unanswerable, only by praying God Almighty to bestow upon him all the true Blessings he can desire, and that it may be my share always to receive rather than to give in that kind. But as to the fault he finds with the Question, I design to shew you in short, that had there been as much haste in him to answer, as *there is plainness in the Query*, he would not have spent a Sheet of Paper so little to the purpose. And when I have done this, I will endeavour to pick an Answer out of his Words, by which I may begin to frame an Argument or two, towards the ending of the Question, which perchance he will make his study not to understand, lest if he should understand them, he may begin to find that he cannot answer 'em. But first, let us see how he *winks*, that he may not see the meaning of the Words set down in the Query.

II. HIS

II. HIS first difficulties are against the ground of my Query, which stands thus; *Supposing this for true, that the Church of Christ can never perish.* I appeal here to any Divine, whether the Words of this Proposition be not clear? Yet here he finds two difficulties. First, he desires to know, what the Word *perish* means? I answer, *To perish, is to cease to be;* to lose the Essence the thing had before it perished. A Man perishes when he dies, because he ceases to be a Man: So the Church of Christ should be said to perish, when it should cease to be the Church of Christ. This is the evident, common, obvious meaning of the Word. But, says he, *perish* may be taken in a *moral sense*, to mean (for example) that the Church perishes, when it ceases to be a *sound, well constituted Church.* 1st, Suppose this were true, it's nothing to his purpose; for Words are to be taken always in their properest signification, unless there be some good reason to the contrary. 2dly, It's absolutely false, that the Church may be said to perish, whilst it retains every thing essential to the Constitution of a true Church, tho' at the same time it remains unsound in some part of it; any more than a Man can be said to *perish* when he loses a Finger, or falls Sick, or when his Face grows dirty, according to his own phrase. And when he will allow, that every Man perishes that falls into a Puddle, and dirties himself; then I will allow this Exception of his to be pertinent. In the mean time, let him reflect, that in case the Church had been unsound, that doth not amount to perishing, but only to being depraved; nor in such case had she *lost her self*, (which is to *perish*,) but only *her Beauty*, or *her sound Constitution.* Besides, what imaginable reason had he to think that I should take the

Word

Word *perish* for being *unsound* (suppose it could be taken so?) For, how could I suppose for true, that the Church of Christ could not grow *unsound*, to them, who ground their Reformation upon this very reason, that she was *corrupted*, and *unsound*? Out of all which it appears manifestly, that he had no reason to doubt of the sense of this Word *perish*.

III. HIS second Cavil is upon these Words, the *Church of Christ*; For, says he, they may be taken in two senses; one as large as *Christianity*; the other for *some part of it greater, or less, but not the universal Church*. Here I might pay him in his own Coin, and ask him, What he means by *Christianity*? whether those Faithful only, that are baptized, as we mean it, or all those, that believe in Christ, whether baptized, or no? But not intending to wait for his answer, I must tell him, that both these senses are absolutely false. And first, that the Church of Christ is not taken for all Christianity, I prove out of their own Definition of the Church, in the 19th Article of the XXXIX. which says thus; *The visible Church is a Congregation of Faithful Men, in the which the pure Word of God is preach'd, and the Sacraments be duly ministred*. It is but too apparent, that this Definition cannot possibly be applied to innumerable Sects, who neither preach the pure Word of God, nor duly minister the Sacraments. Therefore 'tis false that the *Church of Christ* can be taken to signifie all *Christianity*. Besides, suppose it might be taken in that large sense, yet he had no reason to suspect, but that I took it here for the *true Church only, to which the promises of perpetual Duration were given, and for the One, Holy, Catholick, and Apostolical Church, (which soever it be) not including such pitiful Sects, as*

rise

rise
he
tru
Chu
tick
Beh
tlen
othe
say
Nat
on
dom
Or
Eng
I ha
answ
One
Chur
most
or
the
Chur
such
name
it me
he m
of Ch
his C
IV
which
(if th
it wa
says
to an
But,
propo
Prote

rise and fall in every Age. Therefore it's evident, he shut his Eyes here again for fear of seeing the true sense of the Word. But yet says he, *The Church of Christ may be taken for one, or more particular Churches, but not the universal Church.* Behold, Sir, the disingenuous trifling of this Gentleman, who is resolv'd to take the Word in all other Senses but the right one. Suppose I should say, *the Kingdom of England is a rich and glorious Nation,* see how he would raise Difficulties upon these clear Words, *What means he by the Kingdom of England? Does he mean Somersetshire alone? Or Somersetshire, Wiltshire, and Berkshire? Or England, Denmark and Norway?* Just so, when I had said, *the Church of Christ cannot perish;* he answers, *What means he by the Church of Christ? One, or two, or more particular Churches? Or the Church of Christ and all Heresies besides?* As if the most extravagant Heresies were a part of the Church, or as if one or two particular Churches were *the Church of Christ,* and not rather a *part of the Church of Christ.* But these Gentlemen are grown such Strangers to Christ's Church, that when it is named they lift up their Heads and know not what it means. Therefore, if he had been so minded, he might easily have known, that by the Church of Christ, I mean the holy Catholick Church, which his Creed ought to have put him in mind of.

IV. NOW then come we to the Question, which he takes in pieces thus, *I desire to know (if the Protestant Church be the true one) where it was many hundreds of Years before Luther?* This says he, is not one Question but two. I refer it to any Man; there is evidently but one Question. But, says he, an accurate Adversary would have propos'd it in two, thus: *I desire to know if the Protestant Church be the true Church?* If so, I de-
C
fire

fire to know where it was many hundreds of Years before Luther? Had I done so, I should have reckoned my self to have been very formally impertinent. For what Reason had I to make a Question of it, whether he would say the Protestant Church was the true one or no? Things so clear are to be supposed, not asked, by all who would not multiply Questions without end; and I do not conceive why he should be so angry with me for not taking him *to be such a Knave* as to be of a Religion which he would not say was the true one. Surely Faults of this Nature may easily find a Pardon.

V. HIS next trifling is his desiring to know what I mean by *the Protestant Church*. For, says he, there be true Protestant Churches, and not true ones. Here, Sir, pray take notice that he has nothing to complain of, but that I gave him too much Liberty; *I bid him name any which he will call the Protestant Church*, and he has a mind to be confin'd; so that you see a small Subject serves us to wrangle about. But I'm content, let him be confin'd to the Church of *England*, and shew me where there was a Church holding all the Articles of the Church of *England* for 900 or 1000 Years before *Luther*. And since the Word *Luther* gives Offence let it be blotted out; I'm glad he's so much ashamed of the great Captain and Patriarch of the pretended Reformation, *The Chariot of Israel and the Horsemen thereof*, as some have been pleased to call him, and a most excellent Instrument of God, as great Doctors of his own Church have term'd him. His Name I put down only because he marks best the great Epoch of the Protestant Religion, by Reason of his Priority in time, and Fame above others. But since he desires it, let his Name be remov'd and that of

Cranmer's

VI.
Paper
ters,
lage of

Cranmer's be put down, or any other whom he thinks he needs not be ashamed of.

VI. YET still he finds more difficulties in understanding this Phrase, as he calls it, *the Protestant Church*. For, says he, *it may either signifie the Clergy and People of the Church, or the Faith, Worship, and Polity of it*. Why had we not this difficulty started before, when we had the former Dispute about the Word *Church*, that we might have done with it once for all? I defy him to give a Reason, except that the Fancy bit now and not then, or else perchance because he was resolved to have a new *Cavil in reserve* for this Place, and when it's done the difficulty's none. For by the Word *Church* is properly meant a *Congregation of faithful Men, &c.* and this by all sides; so it is in the nineteenth Article of his Church, so it is in all our definitions of the Church, so it is in divers other even heretical definitions of the Church; and I do not remember to have read any where that *Church* is taken for the Faith, Worship, and Polity of the Church. And if he have any where read it, yet he ought to reflect that in reason he should have taken it in that sense, which Divines of all sides take it commonly in, in this Dispute of the Church, *viz. For a Congregation of faithful Men, &c.* and not for *the Faith, &c.* of those Men. Thus you may guess, Sir, that it is a harder thing to bring this Gentleman to the Bar and make him speak out plainly *Guilty* or *not Guilty*, than perchance it would be to convict him after he had once made his Plea.

VII. NOW come we to the last Words of my Paper, which are these, *Name your Bishops, Writers, Churches, nay one single Congregation, or Village of Protestants for 900 or 1000 Years before*

your Separation from the Roman Catholick Church, for those are my Words, *Roman Catholick Church,* as is to be seen in the Paper I sent you, and not these, [*Holy Catholick Church*] as he is pleased to mistake, so there's an end of that Quarrel. Let us now to the purpose.

VIII. *THIS Challenge,* says he, *is fallacious and sophistical,* in asking us to *Name our Bishops, Writers and Churches, &c. i.e. Our reformed Bishops, Writers, and Churches before the Reformation.* I'm sure this Answer is sophistical and a great imposition both upon you and me. Have I any such Words, as *reform'd Bishops, Writers? &c.* No, but he puts the Question in his own sophistical Words, because he cannot answer it in mine? What had they no Bishops or Churches before they were reform'd? How did they do then to reform them? For to reform, is to give a better Form to something which before was under a worse. I demanded where his Church was at all, whether reform'd or deform'd matters not? Cannot he tell me where her *slovenly dirty Face* (according to his own Phrase) once was, because 'tis now washed? Or is it sophistical to ask a sick Man where he was when he was well and lusty? Away, away *this is too visibly idle.* Let the Gentleman know then, that by the Word *Protestant,* I mean Christians professing their Religion; and I cannot imagine what else he could fancy I meant, except he thought me so foolish as to take it for *People protesting against the Decrees of the Diet of Spire,* according to the Original Sense of the Word.

IX. *THUS* far forsooth, was it necessary to dispute like *Grammarians* concerning the meaning of clear Words. But, because it's so difficult a thing to draw him to a direct Answer, I will endeavour to gather one from his Words, which

are

are conformable with those of the other Doctors of his Church, who teach that their Church is nothing but ours reform'd; which this Gentleman explains by the Comparisons of *a dirty Face wash'd, a muddy River cleans'd, and a sick Man heal'd*. But I hope to prove to you that if their Religion were true, our Religion would have been none at all, and consequently incapable of being reform'd; from which I will draw other Consequences of great importance, and this as briefly as may be, not to be tedious.

X. FIRST then, *It is essential to a true Church of Christ, not to teach and practise Idolatry: But the Roman Catholick Church according to their Principles, teaches and practises Idolatry*: This they not only grant, but preach in every Pulpit; we commit Idolatry in worshipping an Host; Idolatry in the invocation of Saints; Idolatry in the worship of Images; nay, this very Gentleman told you, that we gave divine Worship to a wooden Cross: *Therefore the Roman Catholick Church is no true Church of Christ, nor was when they went from it.*

XI. 2dly, I prove it out of the foresaid 19th. Article of their own Church, thus, *The visible Church of Christ is a Congregation of faithful Men, in the which the Sacraments be duly ministred according to Christ's Ordinance: But in the Roman Catholick Church, according to their Doctrine, the Sacraments are not duly ministred, &c.* For they hold but two Sacraments, and of those two it's certain, that according to the Protestants, we do not minister the *Eucharist* according to Christ's Ordinance: It remains then that according to that, we minister only Baptism duly, which is but one Sacrament, not Sacraments: Therefore we have not the due Ministration of Sacraments

in our Church, as their own Definition of a Church requires: *Therefore the Roman Catholick Church is not* (nor was when they left it) *the visible,* (nor a visible) *Church of Christ.*

XII. 3dly, AGAIN, out of the foresaid Article, *The visible Church of Christ is a Congregation of faithful Men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, &c. But in the Roman Catholick Church, according to their Doctrine, the pure word is not preach'd, nor was when they left it.* For *pure* is contrary to *corrupt*, and they teach that our Doctrine is and was corrupt, and our Religion full of gross and damnable Errors, nay they give that for the Reason of their pretended Reformation: *Therefore the Roman Catholick Church, is not, nor was not when they went from it, the visible* (nor a visible) *Church of Christ.*

XIII. THUS I have proved that according to their Principles, the Roman Catholick Church was not a Church of Christ when they pretended to reform it: From whence it follows, 1st. That no Protestant Church could reform it, no more than one can wash a Face that has no Being; so that they are not a reform'd Religion, but absolutely a *new Religion*, that is a false Religion: For it's evident that their Religion's new, if it was not reformed: But I have proved clearly that it was not reform'd: Therefore it's evident it is new: Therefore it's evident it is false.

XIV. IT follows 2dly, That if the Roman Catholick Church was no Church of Christ, as I have proved it was not according to their Principles; it follows, I say, that the true Church of Christ absolutely perish'd and was quite destroy'd for many hundred Years; from whence we may clearly see the Protestant Religions to be all false, from the truth of which would follow so absurd and blasphemous

phemous a Doctrine, as that the Church of Christ was quite destroy'd.

XV. IT follows 3dly, That the Roman Catholick Church is the true Church, for *some Church must be the true Church of Christ, and it can be none, to whom the Promises of indefectibility, or perpetual Duration have not been made good*: But those Promises have not been made good to any but the Roman Catholick, and have evidently fail'd all Protestants for the space of 900 or 1000 Years: Therefore the Roman Catholick Church is the true Church of Christ.

XVI. TO conclude, Sir, this their pretence of asserting their Religion from the Imputation of Newness, and consequently of Falsity, by saying it is the same in Substance with ours, is too visibly false to impose upon any one that will open his Eyes. For they hold but two Sacraments, we hold seven; according to them we commit gross Idolatry, they horrible Impieties and Prophana-tions according to us: We follow the guidance of the Church, they *their own*; which of the one side is the source of many and important Errors. It would be too long to reckon up all the Differences between us, insomuch that it seems clear, that either their Religion or ours is a damnable Heresie; and whethersoever it be, theirs is false. For if our Religion be a damnable Heresie, theirs is a *new one*, as I have proved; and if theirs be a Heresie, it needs no proof that it's false, and so I conclude.

XVII. THUS, Sir, the Gentleman may see, that what I writ concern'd *the Indefectibility and not the Infallibility of the Church*, which I never dream'd of nor intended, as he is pleas'd to imagine. If he designs an Answer to any thing in this, I desire it may be direct and home to the point; and if there

be any Word of uncertain signification, let it be answered by distinguishing according to the Custom of fair and learned Adversarys, and not be sent back with a Number of new Querys to attend it, which is a Fashion newly invented by this Adversary.

XVIII. AS to his many Questions concerning the Infallibility of the Church, we will answer them when we have done with this; in the mean time, let any Impartial Man be our Judge, whether he, or I are the less accurate. I that for a ground of one Query suppos'd a clear Truth, which he dare not deny: Or he, who for one Dispute, has propos'd fifteen or sixteen Points, and several of them of very different Natures, and enough to fill whole Volumes. As for *Vincentius Lirinensis*, we are now actually examining one of his Rules set down in the very Place he cites, where *Vincentius* asserts, those only to be Catholicks, who hold what has been believ'd *every where, always and by all*. And I think I have sufficiently proved that the Church of *England* has not been *always*. Let us try one Rule at once, which I'm sure those will never be against who have a mind to speak closely to any one.

IF the Gentleman should answer this in the same style he did the Query, I suppose you will know how to make a difference betwixt big Words and great Arguments, betwixt ill Language and good Sense. I am,

S I R,

Your most humble Servant,

A. B.

Dr.

*Dr. Hicke's ANSWER to the Reply
sent from the unknown Author by
Mr. —n.*

C H A P. I.

SUPPOSING *this for true, That the Church of Christ can never perish, I desire to know (if the Protestant Church be the true One) where it was for many hundred of Years before Luther? Name your Bishops, Writers, Churches, nay one single Congregation, or Village of Protestants, for 900 or 1000 Years, before your Separation from the holy Catholick Church.*

I. SIR, these are the Words of the Paper which you called your *Query*, as they were sent to me by Mr. —n in his Letter, in which are these Words. *I here send you, as from him, the above written Query.* I thought it convenient for several Reasons, one of which is my own justification, to transcribe it in the head of this Answer to your Reply; in which, Sir, you charge me in your VII Paragraph with a voluntary mistake in changing the Words *Roman Catholick Church* into *holy Catholick Church*. For if I was pleased, as you speak, *to make that mistake*, it was a voluntary and inexcusable mistake; but it was not my mistake but Mr. —n's, as I can shew from his Letter, and as he himself acknowledged to me; nor had I any temptation wilfully to mistake the Words. For in your *Challenge, name your Bishops, &c. for 900 or 1000 Years before your Separation from the*
Roman

Roman Catholick Church, you beg the Question, and take for granted what is the greatest point of Controversie between your Church and ours; as much as if you had said, *your Separation from the holy Catholick Church*. For if the *Roman* be either the *Catholick*, or a *Catholick Church*, we cannot justify our Separation; but we deny it to be either the *Catholick*, or a *Catholick Church*: This you know to be the Question between us and you, and yet you take it for granted; which among other reasons gave me that occasion to say without any Passion, *that had I not been told you were one appointed to manage the Controversie between your Church, and ours, I should rather have thought that your Query, as you call it, had been penned by some Novice*; for one cannot easily imagine that a Person skilful in Controversie, if he were ingenuous, would make his Query terminate in supposing that to be true, or taking that for granted, which the Respondent neither could, nor could be thought to grant.

II. 2dly, Had I mistaken the Word *Holy* for *Roman*, it had been only a *verbal* and not a *real* mistake, because the *Roman Church*, according to its own Doctrines and Principles, *is the holy Catholick Church*, nay the † *holy Catholick Apostolick Church*, as I told Mr. ————n when he begged pardon for his mistake. And therefore, Sir, I could have no design in making the mistake, had it been mine, because it would have been of no Advantage to me; but it is of some Advantage to you to suggest to your Profelyte, as if I had wilfully mistaken it; and therefore you

† *Bulla Pii Papæ IV. super forma juramenti professionis fidei.* Land against Fisher § 38. n. 26. But A. C. tells us it is to be learned of the one holy Cotholick, Apostolick, always visible and infallible Roman Church.

must
clear
of b
Etice
Qua
affir
II
mist
Inde
that
who
fore
some
tlem
the
of t
he w
ber,
that
defe
red T
where
our I
ter,
it, w
beca
bilit
to be
there
relat
ther
impr

‡ A
don M
pagina
debuist
quentit

must give me leave to add, that you have not cleared your self from the dishonourable Charge of *begging the Question*, which is a ‡ common Practice among you, and *so there is not an end of that Quarrel*, (I use your Words) as you confidently affirmed to your Profelyte there was.

III. IN your XVII. Paragraph you lay another mistake to my Charge, of the *Infallibility* for the *Indefeetibility* of the Church. But neither was that mistake, if it was one, mine, but Mr.—n's who first desired we might have a Conference before his Sister of *Transubstantiation*, and then some Days after came to tell me, that the *Gentleman*, as he stiled you, desired it might be of the *Infallibility* of the Church. When I told him of this he could not deny it, nor do I suppose he will deny it now. And perhaps he may remember, when he said *the Infallibility of the Church*, that I asked him, if it was the *Infallibility* or *Indefeetibility* of the Church? to which he answered *The Infallibility of the Church*. And therefore when I saw the Query you sent me in order to our Proceeding, as Mr. ———n said in his Letter, I gave it as the first Reason in my Answer to it, why I thought it drawn up by some *Novitiat*, because it was nothing to the purpose of *Infallibility*, the Subject in which I thought we were to be engaged. In another part of my Letter, there were these Words: *I confess the supposition relates to the Indefeetibility of the Church, but neither that, nor any thing else in his Query, as he improperly calls it, relates to the infallibility of*

‡ Nestarii Patriarchæ Hierosol. confutatio imperii Papæ. London MDCCII. p. 63. Atque equidem ex inscriptione a prima pagina falsam tuam suppositionem confutabo. scil. eam, quam prius debuisti firme probare, ut confessam assumpsisti, & nunc, & in sequentibus.

the Church. Methinks these expressions written with such a Appearance of simplicity, might have obliged you to ask Mr. ———, what he told me the Subject was to be, upon which you invited me to a Conference, before you had charged me with a wrong Imagination of it, and by Consequence with a very great Impertinence, in sending you so many Queries relating to a Subject, which was not to be the Matter of Controversie between us, How this mistake happened between you and him, you best know, and whether it was designed, or no. But if Infallibility was to be the Subject of Controversie between us. I think first I had as much right to send you those Queries relating to it, as you to send me a *Complex Query*, which I neither desired nor expected from you; and therefore to use the Words in your XVIII Paragraph, *I am willing that any impartial Man should be Judge between us, whether you or I were less accurate*, or if you please less impertinent; you, who under the name of one plain Query sent me *many*, attended with a *Supposition*, and a *Challenge*; or I, who sent you many single, plain, distinct Queries relating to what, I really thought, was to have been the Subject of Controversie between us. All the Answer you think fit to give them is this, *We will answer them when we have done with these*; and then you say that *there are 15 or 16 Points before one Dispute, and several of them of very different Natures, and enough to fill whole Volumes.* I will not tell you in your own Words that *this is trifling, nor that it is a hard matter to bring you to the Bar, &c.* But you must give me leave to tell you, that all those Querys you call *Points*, are all Points to the Subject of Infallibility, and directly relate in their different Natures to it, and that

that they are so far from requiring Volumes to answer them, that you might have made a distinct Answer to them in as small a Compass as I proposed them. Was it for Instance so tedious a Matter to have answered *Yes* or *No*, to the Question in which I asked you, whether by the Church's Infallibility you meant, that the Church hath always a living infallible Judge? Or to have told me, whether that living infallible Judge was a single Person, or a Senate, or Council? and if a single Person, where he was always to be found, or where his infallible Chair was? or if the Church knew of any infallible Judge, in the time of *Vincentius Lirinensis*? or if it did, how he came to be ignorant of it? Plain simple Answers to such plain simple Questions would not have taken up much Paper, or much of your time, had you been disposed to make them. And as for my Questions, I had not proposed them, but that sincerely believing the Infallibility of *the Church* was to be the Subject of Controversie between us, I was willing to put you in remembrance by them of the great, and give me leave to tell you, I think, insuperable Difficulties with which that Doctrine is attended, and shew your Profelyte that *the Infallibility of the Church* (by which you still precariously mean the Church of Rome) is it self so far from being certain, that it is one of the greatest Controversies that ever was among Christians, not to be proved by Scripture and Catholick Tradition, or *Antiquity*, *Universallity* and *Consent*. You your self acknowledge *there are 15 or 16 disputable Points in it of different Natures, and enough to fill whole Volumes*; How then can a Doctrine so full of disputable Points be clear and certain, or the Church that pretends to it, be the Guide of Faith? For this reason I desired,
that

that your Profelyte might have the deliberate perusal of my Answer to your Query, thinking that you might have begun with her at that Doctrine; which if it could be proved, would be a compendious way of ending all Controversies in Religion, especially those between our Church and yours, and the most speedy, and effectual means that can be taken of reducing us to your Fold. This Consideration, methinks, should have made you embrace the Opportunity; which the mistake gave you of preferring the Subject of the *Infallibility*, to that of the *Indefeasibility of the Church*, if you thought it to be a clear Christian Verity. But you have promised to consider it hereafter, and then I will expect a Solution of all the Difficulties which lie wrapt up in my Queries, and of all those which are expressed in a Letter of Mr. Chillingworth to Mr. Lewgar, concerning the Church of Rome's being the Guide of Faith, printed with his Book entituled *The Religion of Protestants a safe way to Salvation*, 1687. As also in the Preface of a Book published since I received your Answer, which is intituled *Certamen Religiosum*, printed at Oxford in 8° 1704. Perhaps you may know the Man, who began the Dispute, in six Queries, with the learned Author of that Book. His way of writing and yours are very much alike in complex and captious Queries, in joining the Socinians, and Protestants together; in charging your Adversary with Cavils, Contradictions, and protracted Distinctions; in undervaluing of him and his Answer, in confident Expressions, and treating of him with uncivil Language. Mr. Chillingworth, in his Letter before mention'd, makes the same Objection against *Infallibility* that I do, from *Vincentius Lirinensis*; to which in your answer you make this Reply in your XVIII. Paragraph.

Par
now
in t
tho
beli
thin
of I
leav
cent
ter
Rul
Scri
Reli
foev
very
anci
ter,
and
that
thol
any
And
it, a
but
your
eithe
fessio
must
stim
But
Eng
inde
alwa

+ C
Id pro
Cathol

Paragraph. *As for Vincentius Lirinensis, we are now actually examining one of his Rules set down in the very place he cites, where Vincentius asserts those only to be Catholick, who hold what hath been believed every where, always, and by all; and I think I have sufficiently proved, that the Church of England hath not been always.* Sir, give me leave to tell you, that you have examined *Vincentius* to little purpose, if you can make no better a Reply. For, first you call that *one of his Rules*, which is his only Rule of expounding Scripture, and of determining Controversies in Religion, and that is to believe and embrace whatsoever hath been taught and delivered by *all, every where, and always* (or at all times) *in the ancient Catholick Church.* This in the same Chapter, he calls *following Universality, Antiquity and Consent.* And he † saith again and again, that we ought to believe all Doctrines to be Catholick, and to believe them to be such without any *Doubt* or *Scruple* that have that Testimony. And in my Answer to that Query, I appealed to it, and offered to be tried by it. And you had done but like a fair and generous Adversary, to tell your Profelyte you would join issue with me, either in putting me upon the proof that our Confessions and Doctrines (to prevent Cavil again I must add our *positive* Doctrines) have that Testimony, or in offering to prove that yours had. But instead of this you say, that the Church of *England* has not been *always*, or at all times. No indeed, Sir, you are in the right, it hath not been always, neither as a formed, nor a reformed

† Cap. iii. *Hoc est vere proprièque Catholicum.* Cap. xxxvii. *Id pro indubitato, certo, ratoque habeatur.* Cap. xli. *Id verum & Catholicum absque ullo scrupulo judicaretur.*

Church;

Church, nor hath the Church of *Rome* been always either as a formed, or a deformed Church. But what then? May not a Church be Catholick, that was not always, or at all times from the beginning of Christianity, if it teaches and holds all Catholick Doctrines, that Antiquity always taught in all Churches with one Consent? According to your reasoning a Church cannot be a Catholick Church, because it was not always; then there never was any Catholick Church, but that of † *Jerusalem*, which was the first of all Christian Churches. Nor could the Church of *England*, which you suppose to be an heretical and schismatical Church, by consequence from your Answer, become or recommence Catholick, although she should (which God forbid) return to your Church. Had I been admitted to an oral Conference with you before your Profelyte, I should have shew'd the Weakness of your Answer in this Reply; I would have shew'd you how contrary it was to the reasoning of ‡ *Tertullian*. But any pretended Answer was to serve the turn. She was not to wait a few Months for the Issue of the Controversie [between us,] she might dye, as her Brother said, in the mean time: she was in haste to be gone. Pray, good Sir, did you make the foresaid Answer for her use about the Church of *England* in haste, and through oversight, or no?

† Luke 24. 47. Acts 1. 4.

‡ *Tertul. de præscriptione Hæretic. Cap. 31. Ad hanc itaque formam probabuntur ex illis Ecclesiis, quæ licet nullum ex Apostolis, vel Apostolicis Auctorem suum proferunt, ut multo posteriores, quæ denique ac quotidie instituuntur, tamen in eadem fide conspirantes, non minus Apostolica deputantur, pro consanguinitate Doctrina.* In this manner will they be tryed by those Churches, which though they cannot shew any Apostle, or Apostolick Man for their Founder, as being much later, and founded every Day; yet agreeing in the same Faith, are reputed not less Apostolical for the Consanguinity of their Faith.

If

If it was in haste and through oversight, however, it ought to be matter of Humiliation to you; but if you did not make it in haste, and by oversight, it was from a worse cause, which I will not name, or if I did, should it provoke me to return your own words in the Conclusion of your IV. Paragraph, which I cannot yet bring my self to repeat, though I think it no indecency to put you in remembrance of them. For the reason why I ask this plain Question is, because, after you had said, *you had proved the Church of England was not always*, you add with an Assurance, as well as a Reflection upon me, which my Answer did not deserve, *Let us try one Rule at once, which I am sure those will never be against, who have a mind to speak clearly to any one.* Here you apparently split *Vincentius's one Rule*, which to use your own words, consists of *every where, always, and by all*; and this *one Rule* is a Test of Doctrines, which all Churches ought to believe at what time soever formed, or reformed; but you make it a Test for the Age of a Church, or for the time of its being formed, or reformed; implying that a Church, which was not *always*, cannot be Catholick; and if you had split that excellent Father's *one Rule*, in reference to place, as you do to time, to try our Church by, you might by the same Logick have observed to as little purpose, that *it hath not been every where.*

C H A P. II.

THERE are many such particular Answers and other passages unworthy of you, scattered about in your Reply, which I must take notice of [by themselves] that I may not seem

to omit any thing, before I come to answer the more principal parts thereof.

I. First THEN I must observe how ill you acquit your self of the Charge of sending me a *manifest* Query, under the Name of *one* in terms of uncertain Signification, nay of sending under that Name a Supposition and a Challenge, as well as a Query; to which you answer nothing, in defence of your self for putting a Challenge to your Query. And as for the *Supposition*, you only say in the XVIII. Paragraph, that *you supposed a clear Truth for a Ground of one Query, which I dare not deny.* Whether I dare deny your Supposition, in your sense to be a clear Truth, shall be seen by and by, but in the mean time, my Charge of your want of Skill and Accuracy, as I then thought, in sending me three things so different, under the Name of a Query, would rest upon you; but that I now find by your Reply, it was not want of Skill and Accuracy, but want of something else, that made you couch so many things in the Lines you call'd your Query; and therefore, Sir, I beg your Pardon, for saying, that *had I not been told you were appointed by your Superiour to manage the Controversie, I should have thought it had been penned by some Novice*; I say, Sir, I beg your Pardon for that Mistake, which proceeded from my Charity; but now I find it was drawn up by a *Veteran* (or as I have now just reason rather to say) a *Veterator* in Controversie, who knew how to embroil and perplex, to contrive Snares and Fallacies, to make plain things intricate, by involving many things in one, which were to be separated, in order to a distinct Answer; and by expressing them in Terms of ambiguous and uncertain Signification, to prevent coming to a close Dispute.

pute. You say, you supposed a clear Truth for the Ground of one Query, but why then did you call your Farrago of a Supposition, of a Question, and of a Challenge a Query? Why must one part of your *Melange* give a denomination to the whole? and why did you not say, that you added your Challenge, as a superstructure of your one Query, as well as premised your Supposition for the Ground thereof? At this rate you might have joyned what you would with it under the Name of Grounds, and Superstructures, and Butteresses, and other terms of Building; you might as well have premised another Query, as a Ground to your one Query: But why do I say as well, for it had been better to do so, and more like a fair and a generous Scholastical Adversary, and by consequence more for your Honour to propose things distinctly; and if I do not mistake your Reply, which is not written with Perspicuity, all that you propose, as matter of Controversie between us, is contained in these following Queries, which you might have penned thus, or to this purpose, Sir, I desire to know, 1st. If the one holy Catholick Church of Christ can perish? If not, then, 2dly, I desire to know if the Roman Church from which you separate, be not that one holy Catholick Church? 3dly, I desire to know, if the being of it, as a Church, can consist with such Errors, Innovations, Abuses and Corruptions, as you charge it with? If not, then, 4thly, I desire to know if it was no Church, or in other terms, not a Church of Christ when you pretended to reform it? If so, 5thly, I would know how a Reformation could be made of no Church, or of a Church, that had no being? Or how you could reform that into a Church, which was not a Church of Christ? Lastly, If the Church of Rome, was

no Church, or not a Church of Christ, when you reform'd it, then I would know, how your Church can be a reformed Church? Or your Religion a reformed Religion? For you could not reform what was not, therefore *your Religion is not a reformed Religion, but absolutely a new Religion, i. e. a false Religion.* Sir, all that is in the best part of your Reply to my Answer, may be reduced to these points, and all the Strength of it (if I may call so much Weakness Strength) is contained in them; and had you sent me these, or the like distinct and plain Queries according to the Laws of Controversie, you should have had a speedy and clear Answer to them; but instead of such Queries you sent me a Medly, manifold and confused Query, in words of uncertain Signification, on purpose to confound the Controversie, to cast a Mist before the Eyes of your Female Profelyte, and to employ me in separating one part of it from another, and distinguishing the abiguous Terms, in all the parts of it, into their severall Significations, that I might not come immediately to the Merits of the Cause, and a close and solid Dispute.

II. I shall consider the most material part of your Reply, which I think reduceable to those Queries, before I have done, but I must go on in answering the scattered Passages of your Reply, [which for methods sake I am forced to separate from the rest] and first of all I must take notice of the special part of your mongrel Query, I mean *the Question* which lies intrenched between the Supposition and the Challenge in these words: *I desire to know, (if the Protestant Church be the true one,) where it was many hundred Years before Luther?* This I told you was not one, but two Questions, which an accurate Adversary would have proposed

sed thus, 1st. *I desire to know if the Protestant Church be the true Church?* If so, then I desire to know, where it was many hundred Years before Luther? To this Charge your reply nothing in your first Paragraph, but only call it a *short Query*, which you could not imagine had so much of Ambiguity in it, as to render it incapable of an Answer, you should have added, without so much distinguishing. But, Sir, the Secrets of your Imagination are best known to your self, and if my Imagination may be set against yours, I cannot but imagine that you, who were the *Strophe Inventor*, the *Dolifabricator*, the crafty Architect of all that Ambiguity must needs be conscious of it, both when you contrived your Query, and when you read my Answer to it. Do you not plainly see, that the Parenthesis in it, viz. *If the Protestant Church be the true one?* Is it self one Query; and then the other part, *where it was many hundred Years before Luther?* you will not deny to be another. If you do not discern the Parenthesis of your short plain Query [as you call it] to be a Query, or contain the Nature of a Question in it, it is to return your own words, because you *wink so hard*, you will not see it. All indifferent Persons that have but good natural Logick, and much more those who have learned the Artificial, will discern it at first sight. But, Sir, to help your Imagination a little, I will beg leave to illustrate the *plural Nature* of your Query, with some others of the like sort, in matters of a different Nature. e. g. Sir, I desire to know (if *Episcopacy is of divine Right*) whether it was immediately instituted by Christ. In this Query, as in yours, there are apparently two Questions, one imply'd in the Parenthesis, *If Episcopacy is of Divine Right?* and the other

expressed, whether it was immediately instituted by Christ. And the Respondent to whom this complex plural Query is proposed, must give it two distinct Resolutions. First, by answering, that Episcopacy is, or is not of Divine Right, and then that it was, or was not immediately instituted by Christ. Such a Query also is this, that must require two distinct Answers, and by Consequence be a double Query; Sir, I desire to know (if the Carthusians are Monks) who was the Founder of the Order? And this also; Sir, I desire to know (if the Cardinals are Dignitaries of the Roman Church) when the Dignity of the Cardinalat began? Thus it is easie to couch two or more Querys in one, and it is allowable in many ways of writing for brevity sake. But to do so in strict Controversie, you know, Sir, is always counted base and dishonourable, against the Rules of Logick, and the Honour of all Disputes for Truth. I thought fit to premise these parallel Questions in my justification, before I took notice of what you say in your IV. Paragraph. There maintaining your Query to be but one, you say, Now come we to the Question, which he takes in pieces. This saith he, is not one Question but two; I refer it to any Man, there is evidently but one Question. And, Sir, I am so willing to refer it to any Man, that I intend to make all Men Judges of this, and every thing else in Controversie between us, and so let my willingness to refer it, be as good an Argument as yours. Then say you, if I had proposed it in two Questions, I should have reckoned my self to have been very formally impertinent. For what Reason had I to make a Question of it, whether he would say the Protestant Church was the true one, or no? Things so clear are to be supposed not asked by all,

who

who would not multiply Questions without end. But I am sure, Sir, this Reply of yours is very formally impertinent. *First*, Because you know I excepted against the complex Phrase of *the Protestant Church*, telling you that there were many Protestant Churches, of which some were true, and some not true Churches; and therefore you could not but question, whether I would say so improper a thing, as that the *Protestant Church* was the *true one*, when I had shewed you the Impropriety of the Phrase, wherein you speak of many independent Churches of different Re-formations, and Communion, as if they were one. *Secondly*, You could not in reason suppose, I would say or allow it, though you had put the Question of the Protestant Church of *England*. For to say *the Protestant Church of England is the true one*, is either to suppose there is no other Protestant Church, or that it only is the true Protestant Church, which are equally false and absurd. But, *Thirdly*, if you had no Reason to make it a Question, whether or no I would allow *the Protestant Church to be the true one*, why did you put it without Reason in these words, *if the Protestant Church be the true Church?* Every *if* implies a Doubt, and every Doubt implies a Query or Question; and therefore it is all one to ask, *I desire to know (if the Protestant Church be the true one) where it was many hundred Years before Luther?* As to say in two Questions, *I desire to know whether the Protestant Church be the true one, and if it be, where it was many hundred Years before Luther?* The former Query calls the Truth of the Protestant Religion as much into Doubt, and makes a Question of it, as much as the two latter. And there is no other difference between them, but that the Que-

tion is expressed in the one, and implied in the other. Would you not think, Sir, I called your Honesty in question, if I should say, *I desire to know (if you are an honest Man) when you'll pay me what you owe me?* Fourthly, You ought as much to suppose, that I believe; and would affirm the Protestant Religion to be a thousand Years older than *Luther*, as that I believe it to be the true one; for it cannot be the true one, unless it is as old as the time of the Apostles; and therefore if such a Supposition was a good Reason, why the Parenthesis, *if the Protestant Church be the true one*, was not a Question, then it is as good a Reason against the whole Query; and so you asked nothing, you made no question, but supposed all. To conclude in your obliging words, *If you could not take me to be such a Knave, as to be of a Religion, I would not say was the true one*, surely you could not take me to be so much a Fool and Knave too, as to be of a Religion which I did not think to be as much older than *Luther*, as *St. Peter himself* was. I assure you, Sir, I would not be of a Religion, which I did not know, and believe to be as old, as the Christian Faith, and therefore I can never be of yours.

III. BUT 2dly, to shew you the *secundity* of your Query, and how many others it hath in the Belly of it, I put you in mind, that there were many Protestant Churches of different kinds, and that before I could answer your Query, I must ask you (as I thought the Laws of Logick and Disputation obliged me) what Protestant Church or which of the Protestant Churches you meant? and when you explained your self, I told you I would return an Answer. This I did to shew, that your Query, besides that comprehended in the

Paren-

Parenthesis, had as many more Querys in it, as
 there were Protestant Churches, true or false, per-
 fect or imperfect, heretical or not heretical, of
 the same or different Reformations. And to this
 you have nothing to reply, but, 1st, *That it is*
trifling. 2^{dly}, *That I had nothing to complain of*
but that you gave me too much Liberty. 3^{dly}, *That*
you bid me name any which I would call the Prote-
stant Church, but that I had a mind to be confined.
And lastly, that you are content to let me be confi-
ned to the Church of England. In Answer to the
 first, I say, that my desiring to know what Church
 you meant by *the Protestant Church*, was not *tri-*
fling, as you modestly call it, but observing the
 Laws of Controversy and the Rules of Disputa-
 tion; according to which, no ambiguous Term
 can be defined, before it is distinguished into its
 various significations, nor any ambiguous Question
 answered, till it is known in which of its Senses
 it was proposed. To the second I say, that what
 you miscall Liberty, was sophistical Ambiguity;
 of which though I exposed it, I did not complain,
 otherwise than by saying your Query was not
 penned as one would have expected it from a
 fair and learned Adversary; and if the Laws of
 Disputation and Controversie be such as just now
 mentioned, I had reason to say so, and now I say
 it again. To the third I answer it is not true,
 that you bid me name any Protestant Church;
 where did you bid me name any, or by whom?
 Not in your Query, nor in any Letter, or by a-
 ny Message after I received it. And where-
 as you say, I had a mind to be confined; I an-
 swer, it was I that was to confine you by the
 Rules of Logick and Disputation; and when you
 saw I would confine you, then in the last place,
 you are graciously pleased to say you are con-
 tented

tented to let me be confined to the Church of England. And seeing I have forced you to confine your loose Query to that Church, I shall, before I have done, shew you, by God's Assistance, where there was a Church, that held all the Articles of the Church of England nine hundred or a thousand Years agoe. But, Sir, to shew you how weak, and really trifling your Reply is, let me put the Case, that a Gentleman should send the following Query to a King at Arms: Sir, I desire to know (if I am qualified to be admitted to the honourable Order of Knighthood) what it would cost me to be created a Knight? As I put this Case for the better illustration of the Case between us, allow me to suppose, the King at Arms sent him this Answer. Sir, your Question is not one, but two, which you should have proposed thus. Sir, I desire to know if I am qualified to be admitted to the honourable Order of Knighthood, and if I am, secondly, What it would cost me to be created a Knight? Besides, Sir, there are several Kinds or Orders of Knighthood, and of different Dignities and Charges, and before I can answer these Questions, I must know what Order of Knighthood you mean. But to carry on the Parallel, I must in the third place suppose the Gentleman made him this Reply. Sir, your Answer is trifling, in desiring to know what Order of Knighthood I meant. I gave you too much Liberty, I bid you name any which you would call an Order of Knighthood, but you had a mind to be confined. I see a small thing will serve you to wrangle about, but you may if you will confine yourself to the most noble Order of the Garter. Sir, you know for whose sake I have made this Apologue, and you cannot but guess to whom I leave the Application.

IV. To your Query, *where the Protestant Church was 900 or 1000 Years before Luther?* I made this Answer, that if by the Protestant Church you meant the Faith, Worship, and Polity of the Church of England, I would tell you where the Church of England was many hundred Years before Luther, or if you pleased before the Council of Trent; even where the present Faith, Worship, and Polity of the Roman Church never was, *i. e.* in the Primitive Church. I told you I said before the Council of Trent, because Luther was none of our Reformers, and because I should rather have expected, that a fair and learned Adversary would have said, *I desire to know where the Church of England, or where your Religion was for 900 or 1000 Years before the pretended Reformation?* as I told you, you might have said without Offence. To this you reply without any Answer, *since the word Luther gives Offence, let it be blotted out, I am glad he is so much ashamed of the great Captain and Patriarch of the pretended Reformation, the Chariot of Israel, and the Horseman thereof, as some have been pleased to call him, and a most excellent Instrument of God, as great Doctors of his own Church have termed him. His Name I put down only, because he makes the great Epoch of the Protestant Religion, by reason of his Priority in time, and Fame above others. But since he desires it, let his Name be removed, and that of Cranmer's be put down, or any other whom he thinks he needs not be ashamed of.*

BUT pray, Sir, who told you I was ashamed of Luther, or by what Inference do you prove I was? I only meant to shew how absurd it was in you to ask of a Doctor of the Church of England, whom you had challenged as such, where the Protestant

Protestant Religion was before *Luther*? Because, as I told you, *Luther* was none of our Reformers, and will now add what was implied in that Remark, that ours and the *Lutheran*, are different Reformations; which made me tell you, I expected that you should have put the Question to me about the Church of *England*, which as you know, differs from all the *Lutheran* Churches in one point of Doctrine, and in Polity, or Government from some. But you could not forbear shewing your Rancour against the Instrument which God raised up to expose the Corruptions of your Church, and to persuade so great a part of the Northern World to shake of the Papal Tyranny, which neither we nor our Fathers were able to bear. Father *Paul* only wanted his Courage to do the same on the other side the *Alps*, and he used to wish that God had given him the Spirit of *Luther*, and sometimes wept to think he had it not. You shew your Rancour also against Archbishop *Cranmer*, and against all our Reformers in your Letter of the 10th. of last *April*, which is nothing to the Merit of the Controversie, nor serves for any purpose, but to invite me to put you in remembrance of the monstrous Wickedness of many of your † Popes, which I could shew out of your own Writers. One of which, ‡ Cardinal *Turrecremata*, saith of Pope *John XII* (whom *Platina* call's *John the XIII.*) that because his Life was detestable and wonderful offensive to Christian People, Christ himself gave out the Sentence of Death against him. For when he was in the Act of Adultery with another Man's Wife, the

† See *Tortura Torti* p. 219.

‡ *Summa de Ecclesia*, lib. 2 cap. 103.

Devil struck him suddenly, and so he died without Repentance.

V. IN the XVII. Paragraph you say: *If he designs an Answer to any thing in this Reply, I desire it may be direct and home to the point.* By this time I hope you are convinced, that I designed an Answer to every thing in it, tho' to the great loss of my precious time, and that you begin to be sensible how direct, and home it is in every part to the point. Then you proceed: *If there be any word of uncertain signification, let it be answered by distinguishing according to the Custom of fair and learned Adversaries, and not be sent back with a number of Querys to attend it, which is a fashion newly invented by this Adversary.* This you say to suggest to your Profelyte, and her Brother, as if I had not rightly and fairly distinguished your Query into two, and then by observing that there were several different Protestant Churches, shewed that each of them was really as many Questions as there were different Protestant Churches, which you notwithstanding absurdly and fallaciously call the Protestant Church. And therefore, Sir, to answer you *directly, and home to the point*, I must plainly tell you, that bare Suggestions and Affirmations without Proof against my Distinctions, as if they were not according to the Custom of fair Adversaries, and the Laws of Controversie, is a Proof that they were. Here you only suggest, or suppose they were not; in some places you affirm your Query was but one, and a short one, tho' prefaced with a Supposition, and backed with a Challenge; and in another place, already taken Notice of, *you refer it to any Man to judge whether it was one Query, or two.* But these are

no

no Arguments against my Distinctions, which I have here proved to be fair and just, and necessarily by the Rules of Logick and Disputation, to shew the complex and intangling Nature of it. And whereas you tell your Disciples, that returning Queries to Queries, is a Fashion newly invented by me, you impose upon their Understandings, and abuse their Credulity. For there is nothing more common in Controversie, than for one Adversary to return Queries for Queries to another; especially to an Adversary, who proposes ambiguous, captious and sophistical Queries. This is often necessary to shew an Adversary the fallacies of his Queries, or others the Impertinence of them, or to obviat some Design he had in proposing of them, or to chastise his Confidence, and silence him by a Query of the like Nature, and not to mention others, you may find this Fashion much used by Mr. *Chillingworth* in his Safe way, and Conference with *Lewgar*. But what need I name Mr. *Chillingworth*, a greater than he; a greater than *Solomon*, to guard against entangling Questions return'd Queries to Queries. *Math.* XXI. 23, 24, 25, XXII. 16, 17, 18, 19, 20.

VI. IN your tenth Paragraph you tell your Disciples, I said that *you gave Divine Worship to a wooden Cross*. It is true, Sir, I did say that *you gave Divine Worship to a material Cross*, and I said it to them, and offered to prove it, but they declined it. And that neither you, or they may think, I cannot make my saying good, I here undertake the Proof of it, out of the Roman *Pontifical de Benedictione novæ Crucis*, where after the solemn Consecration of a material Cross or Crucifix by Incense, holy Water, and Prayers, it is said in the

the P
nibm
ciunt
kneel
adore
the f
cipie
gati,
Glad
that
mater
Latri
mater
Cross
the l
the M
know
Wor
own
this a
dresse
viary.

† T
raiceu
Sacerdo
† In
onis Cr

the Rubrick, *tum Pontifex flexis ante Crucem genibus, ipsam devote adorat, & osculatur. Idem faciunt quicunque alii voluerint*: then the Bishop kneeling before the consecrated Cross, devoutly adores and kisses it, and as many as will, may do the same. So in the Rubric of the *Ordo ad recipiendum processionaliter Imperatorem. Crux Legati, quia debetur ei Latria, erit a dextris, & Gladius Imperatoris a Sinistris.* † Here I observe that *the Worship signified by Latria is due to the material Cross: But Divine Worship is signified by Latria*: Therefore Divine Worship is due to the material Cross. The *Major* is evident, for the Cross of the Pope's Legat is a material Cross, as the Emperor's Sword is a material Sword; and the Minor needs no Proof to Roman Priests, who know the special Sence of *Latria* for Divine Worship, in their own Church, and among their own Writers, as well as among the Greeks. To this agree your Churches invocations of, and addresses to the material Cross in the Roman Breviary.

‡ *O Crux ave spes unica
Hoc passionis tempore!
Piis adauge gaudium
Reisque dele Crimina,*

*Nobile lignum exaltatur.
Christi fides rutilat
Dum Crux ab omnibus veneratur.*

† To this add the Rubrick of the *Missal*, in feria vi. de paraceue, beginning with these words: *Completis orationibus, Sacerdos, &c.*

‡ In sabbato ante Dominicam passionis. In Festo inventionis Crucis. In Festo exaltationis Crucis.

This

THIS Address is made to the *Arbor decora
& fulgida*, &c. the beautiful and resplendent Tree,
upon which our Lord hung.

*Crux fidelis inter omnes
Arbor una Nobilis,
Sylva talem nulla profert,
Fronde, flore, germine.*

Elette ramos Arbor alta,

*Sola digna tu fuisti
Ferre mundi victimam, &c.*

*O Crux signum triumphale!
Mundi vera salus vale.
Inter ligna nullum tale,
Fronde, flore, germine
Medicina Christiana
Salva sanos, ægros sana.
Quod non valet vis humana,
Fit in tuo nomine.*

THIS Address shews it is the material Cross
you invoke, when kneeling before it you say as
above, or here below.

*O Crux ave spes unica,
In hac Triumphi Gloria
Piis adauge gratiam
Reisque dele Crimina.*

*O Crux splendidior cunctis astris, mundo celebris,
hominibus multum amabilis, sanctior universis, quæ
sola fuisti digna portare talentum Mundi: Dulce
lignum, dulces clavos, dulcia ferens pondera: Sal-
va præsentem Catervam in tuis hodie Laudibus
congregatam*

Congr
Missa
gliff
Deus
vifica
nexib
I hope
I bese
Invoca
I am
shew
materi
or any
900,
lyte to
VII.
Paragr
your sh
etor,
could
ambigu
Answer
to Pass
add;
rable,
on him
that it
than gi
HO
short 2
badness
ter it in
and sup
in dispu
† P. 6,
tua Sophi
doctores il

Congregatum. Add to these those out of the Missal, *Secundum usum Sarum*, part of the English corrupt Worship before the Reformation: *Deus concede propitius, ut qui ad adorandam vivificam crucem adveniunt a peccatorum suorum nexibus liberentur.* In Exalt. Sanctæ Crucis. Sir, I hope I have now made good my Charge, and I beseech you to be so just, as to translate these Invocations faithfully to your new Convert, for I am ashamed to translate them; and if you can shew me any such Prayers, and Addresses to the material Cross upon record in any Office of your, or any other Church (to use your own Epoch) 900, or 1000 Years ago, I will be your Proselyte too.

VII. I have not yet taken notice of your first Paragraph, in which you say, when you sent your short Query to be proposed to a learned Doctor, as I presume, you speak Ironically, you could not imagine, there had been either *so much ambiguity in it*, as to render it incapable of an Answer, or much less any thing to *povoke a Man to Passion, or injurious Language.* And then you add; *as to the ill Language, it is by me unanswerable, only by praying God Almighty to bestow upon him all the true Blessings he can desire, and that it may be my share always to receive, rather than give in that kind.*

HOW much Ambiguity there was in your short Query, hath been shewn already, and as the badness of your Cause, requires you should shelter it in Ambiguities, and begging the Question, and supposing the Truth of things, which are in dispute, and using other Sophistries: (as † Ne-

† P. 6, 63, 72, 86, 127, 245, & 249. *Quam varia est ars tua Sophistica, vel hoc solo te veritati non in nutritum apud tuos doctores illa demonstrat.*

Clariss of *Hierusalem* hath observed it is common for your Writers to do) so none endeavours to do so more than you. Thus knowing it usual with you by the *Church*, or *the Church of Christ*, or *the true Church*, or the holy Catholick Apostolical Church, to understand *your own Church*; in my Answer to your Query, I desired to know what you meant by *the true Church of Christ* in your Supposition, whether the *universal Church dispersed over the Earth*, or *some part of it greater or less, comprehending one, or more Churches*? I put this Question to you, because I perceived you only meant your own Church; and I find I was not mistaken, for in your Reply, you say you took it for *the true Church only, to which the promise of perpetual Duration was given, and for the one holy Catholick, Apostolick Church*. Thus in your third Paragraph. But then in your fifteenth, you speak more plainly, asserting the Roman Catholick Church (as you call it) to be *the true Church of Christ*, to whom all the Promises of Indefeasibility and perpetual Duration have been made good. Now, Sir, this being your meaning, why did you not at first word your Supposition thus? *Supposing this for true, that the Roman Catholick Church can never perish, I desire to know, &c.* Thus plainly proposed, your Supposition had been void of all Ambiguity, and lurking meanings, and we had come presently to argue the main Point before your Profelyte, and her Brother; but this you durst not do, because you knew I should have told you in my Answer, your Supposition was not true, and that you supposed what, you knew, we could not grant, begging the grand Question between us, and presuming that to be true, which is not only altogether false, but partly absurd,

viz.

viz.
Corr
of y
ambi
to th
want
I said
or so
of A
is the
a No
St. P
tum,
vert,
to yo
sent i
ther t
Langu
there
you c
which
to cre
your A
cannot
give il
fled.
themse
have a
cused
he said
as littl
your C
not ski
not giv
ous L
with y
words.

viz. that a *Particular* is the *Universal*, and a *most Corrupt* a *Catholick Church*. The like I observed of your Challenge, and finding *your little Paper* ambiguous in all the Parts of it, I was willing to think that Ambiguity proceeded rather from want of Art, than an ill use of it; and therefore I said it looked, as if it was penned by a *Novice*, or *some new Convert*; which you in your Letter of April 10th. say *that is like a Fool*. But, Sir, is there no difference between being a Fool, and a *Novice*, or a recent in Controversie? When St. Paul said *Oportet esse Episcopum non Neophytum*, a Bishop must not be a *Novice*, or new Convert, did he mean *not a Fool*? I shew'd my Answer to your Query to several Men of temper, before I sent it to you, only to have their Opinion, whether there was any thing of provoking, or undecent Language in it, and they all were of Opinion, there was nothing of that Nature therein; but you cry out of *passion and injurious Language*; which I know to be an *Art* among your Writers to create Prejudice in your *Catechumens* against your Adversaries, as Men of violent Passions, who cannot argue fairly, but instead of Arguments give ill words, because they find themselves baffled. Nay, they often do so, when they find themselves like to be worsted, that they may have a Pretence to desist. I knew one, who accused his Antagonist of ill Language, because he said one of his Propositions was *false*, and for as little Reason you accuse me for saying I thought your Query was written by a *Novice*, *who was not skilled in Controversie*. But whether you have not given me provoking, passionate, and injurious Language in ample Measure, inconsistent with your formal Prayer, I appeal to your own words. *I will endeavour (say you) to pick an*

Answer out of his words, by which I may begin to frame an Argument or two, which perhaps he will make it his study not to understand, lest if he should understand them, he may begin to find that he cannot answer them. It's evident he shut his Eyes here again, for fear of seeing the true sense of the word. Let us see how he winks, that he may not see the meaning of the words in the Query. The disengenuous trifling of the Gentleman, who is resolv'd to take the words in all other senses, but the right one. Those Gentlemen are grown such Strangers to Christ's Church, that when it is named they lift up their Heads, and know not what it means. I do not understand why he should be angry with me, for not taking of him to be such a Knave, as to be of a Religion he would not say was the true one. His next Trifling is to know what I mean by the Protestant Church; I am sure this Answer is sophistical, and a great Imposition both upon you and me. I desire him to give a Reason, except the Fancy bit now, and not then——He has resolved to have a new Cavil in reserve for this place. It is a harder thing to bring this Gentleman to the Bar, and make him speak out plainly guilty, than perhaps it would be to convict him after he had once made his Plea. Away, away, this is visibly idle, it's a difficult thing to draw him to a direct Answer. Thus, Sir, you pray and reproach; bless and persecute; forgive pretended Injuries, and return them at the same time. Give me leave to put that Question of St. James to you, doth a Fountain send out at the same place sweet Water, and bitter? and to put you in mind of what the Satyr said to the Man in the Fable, who blew both hot and cold with the same Mouth. It was for this Reason, that in my Reply to your Letter of April 2. I pray'd you to write, when you

you
Petis
beco
Grav
more
your
not b
ed, f
To th
dest
these
more
this,
biguo
tain
begin
trove
Char
rathe
it as
thing
fear
told
chang
VI
taken
one m
The C
call i
shops,
gation
Tears
stake
obser
took
Answ
was f

you wrote next, not only with more Care and Perspicuity; and Propriety of Expression, as it becomes a Controversial Writer, but with more Gravity, and in a more modest Stile, and with more respect to your Adversaries, that in case your Papers came to be publish'd, you might not be obnoxious to the just Censure of the learned, sober and judicious Men of all Religions. To this you reply'd, that it had been more modest and just in me to have given my advice in these terms, *Let us both hereafter write with more Gravity, and in a more modest Stile*; and this, because I was tempted to think by the ambiguous terms in which you penned your uncertain and complex Query, &c. that you were a beginner, who was not much experienc'd in Controversie; and you are offended at me for my Charity, in thinking that it was want of skill, rather than a worse defect, that made you pen it as you did, beg the question, and suppose things which were not to be supposed; and I fear you will be more offended when I have told you, that your Reply hath obliged me to change my Opinion.

VIII. AMONG other things in it, which I have taken notice of above, give me leave to observe one more which shews you to be a Man of Art. The Challenge-part of your *little Paper*, as you call it, is penn'd in these words, *Name your Bishops, Writers, Churches, nay one single Congregation, or Village of Protestants, for 900 or 1000 Years, before your Separation from the holy (mistaken for Roman) Catholick Church.* After I had observed how you begged the question, I also took notice to your Disciple, Mr. ----- (for my Answer was written to him) that your Challenge was fallacious, and sophistical in asking me to

name our Bishops, Writers and Churches, that is, said I, our reform'd Bishops, Writers and Churches before the Reformation; which is the same as if he had asked me to name our reformed Bishops and Churches, before they were reformed; and as absurd as to ask us to shew the Alteration and Change of any other Society, or Thing, before it was so altered and changed. I farther added, that you might as reasonably have asked me to Name our Protestant Kings and Courts before Edward VI. to shew him how captious and tricking your Challenge was. Now in your Reply to this, you say that my Answer is Sophistical, and a great imposition upon you and him, because you had no such words, as reform'd Bishops and Writers. Say you, have I any such words as reformed Bishops and Writers? And did I say you had? No, what I said was, that to ask me to Name our Bishops, Writers and Churches before the Reformation, was the same as to ask me to Name our reformed Bishops, Writers, and Churches before they were reformed. These are not your words, but as I observed the obvious and plain import of your words; for no unreformed Writers, Bishops, or Churches, can in any propriety of Speech be called Ours. And if you did not design it for a captious Challenge, why did you not, as I took notice, put it in these, or the like Terms. Name any Bishops, Writers, or Churches, nay, any one single Congregation, or Village of Christians of your Religion for 900, or 1000 Years before your Separation from the Roman Catholick Church. Had you done so, you had had a fair and plain Answer. But this, as you tell your Convert and her Brother, was putting the question (for so you now call your Challenge) in my own sophistical words, because I could not
answer

*answ
Soph
If th
ing
of th
shew
whic
cal,
evid
them
you,
leng
whic
Let
by th
sing
sense
Bisho
greg
gion
from
I wi
Chal
two
Answ
IX
Bish
greg
1000
Chur
truth
by a
throu
stles
trary
the
tius*

answer it in yours. But pray, Sir, is there any Sophistry in the Challenge put in my words? If there is, why did you not shew it? For saying is no proving. Why did you not shew which of the words are sophistical? Why did you not shew their ambiguous and uncertain signification, which makes them to be fallacious and sophistical, as I have done by all yours. But it is an evident proof, whatever you pretend, you thought them not sophistical, because they have forced you, tho' with an ill grace, to explain your Challenge, in the plain, certain and reasonable sense, which, in my words, they offer at the first sight. *Let the Gentleman (say you) know then, that by the word Protestant, I mean Christians professing their Religion.* Do you so, Sir, then the sense of your Challenge is plainly this, *Name any Bishops, Writers, Churches, nay one single Congregation of Christians, that professed your Religion 900 or 1000 Years before your separation from the Roman Catholick Church.* And here, Sir, I will joyn issue with you, and answer your Challenge in this sense, after I have premised two or three things in order to a plain and clear Answer to it.

IX. FIRST then, in case I could not name any Bishops, Writers, Churches, or Christian Congregations, that professed our Religion 900. or 1000 Years before our Separation from your Church, it ought to be no Argument against the truth of it, if I can shew that it was professed by all faithful Bishops, Writers and Churches through all Centuries, from the time of the Apostles to either of those periods. On the contrary, it will be a demonstrable Argument for the truth of it, according to the Rule of *Vincen-tius Lirinensis*, who asserts that, and that only

to be the true Catholick Faith, or Religion, which hath the testimony of Scripture, and Catholick Tradition before his time, or which can be proved by *Antiquity, Universality and Consent*. Secondly, In case I could not answer your Challenge in *Naming any Bishops, Writers, or Churches* that professed our Religion 900 or 1000 Years before our Separation, yet you could make no advantage of it, because you can name none, who professed yours, as distinguished from ours, in either of those times. Thirdly, In naming Bishops, Writers, and Churches, that professed our Religion in those, or earlier times, I must except the negative Doctrines of our Religion, which you have been told, cannot be older than the more modern Errors, which they deny [and against which we protest.] Fourthly, I must also except all Doctrines and Traditions, whether consisting solely in Opinion, or tending to Practice, *which Bishops, Writers, and Churches* may differ in, and yet be, and be esteemed of the same Religion, and hold Communion with one another, notwithstanding their different Opinions and Practice [in such Doctrines and Things] such as these was the Doctrine of re-baptizing those, who had been baptized by Hereticks, which was held differently by the † African Churches, with some of the ‡ Oriental Churches, and the Church of Rome, who were of the same Religion, and Communion with one another. So the Eastern and Western Church differed in their Opinions

† *Tertul. de Pudicitia, cap. 19. Prescript. adversus Hæret. cap. 12. de Baptismo, Cyprian LXXIII. Epist. ad Jub. 69. Epist. LXXI. ad Quintum de baptizandis ad d. Hæret.*

‡ *Firmiliani Epist. ad Cyprian. LXXV. Lombert's Preface before his Translation of Cyprian's Works into French, p. 77.*

and Practice, as to the time of *observing Easter* || and yet both thought themselves of the same Religion, and lived after some debate in perfect Concord with one another, as *Polycarp* Bishop of *Smyrna* did with Pope *Anicetus*. Though Pope *Victor* afterwards was for breaking of Communion with the Asian Churches, because they would not keep *Easter* at the time the Latins did. Hitherto therefore I may reduce all differences in Churches, as to Liturgies, Ceremonies, Penances, Rituals, Ordinals, Calendars, or number of festival Days, provided they are pure, as to Substance, or have no intolerable Errors, or Corruptions in them. Likewise all Doctrines, which not being any part of the Christian Faith, or necessarily to be believed, or disbelieved, in order to Salvation, may be held in the affirmative, or negative, without any danger to the Soul; as the ancient Doctrine of the Millenaries, which though generally believed for almost the three first Centuries, is now a Heresie in your Church, and I think rejected by all other Churches; so many Bishops and Fathers of ancient times thought it safest, if not necessary, for little Children to receive the holy Eucharist. It was always the practice of the African Church. And in the time of St. *Augustin*, Pope † *Innocent* the First, as well as he, thought it necessary; and if it was that Pope's belief, no Man will doubt, but it was then the belief of the Church of *Rome*, though it now stands condemned and anathematized by the Council of *Trent*, *Sess. XXI. Can. IV.* Thus Opi-

|| *Euseb. Ecc. Hist. lib. V. cap. XXIV.*

† St. *Aug. Ep. to the Fathers of the Milevitan Council*, which is the XCIII. inter *Epist. Augustini Tom. II. & Contra Julianum, lib. I. cap. II.*

nions and Practices, which do not affect the common Faith of Christians, I mean the Faith once delivered by the Apostles to the Saints, nor have any necessary ill influence upon good Life and Manners, nor are contrary to positive Divine Institutions, but may be safely taught in one Age or Church, and not in another, make no difference as to Religion between Bishops and Bishops, Writers and Writers, Churches and Churches.

C H A P. III.

I. **T**HESE four Preliminaries being promised to make a more regular, clear and short Answer to your Challenge, I assert, First, That 1000 Years before our Reformation from your Church, that is to say, in the middle of the sixth Century, or the Year of our Lord 556. the whole Catholick Church, the Church of *Rome* not excepted, then professed the Religion of the reformed Church of *England*, or which is the same thing in other terms, the reformed Church of *England*, professeth, and hath the same [Faith or] Religion, which the whole Catholick Church, the Church of *Rome* not excepted, professed in the middle of the VIth Century. This I affirm, because she hath the same Canon of Scripture, and the same Canon of Faith, *i. e.* the Apostles Creed [commonly so called] as confirmed and explained in the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Confessions against the Heresies of the *Arians*, *Eunomians*, or *Eudoxians*, *Semiarians*, or opposers of the Godhead of the Son, and the Holy Ghost, together with the *Sabellians*, *Marcellians*, *Photinians*, and *Apollinarians*, all Enemies of the Catholick

Catholick and Apostolick Faith. She also owns, as the whole Catholick Church then did, the Doctrine and Confessions of the first General Council of *Ephesus*, and of the General Council of *Chalcedon*, which guarded the Apostolick Canons of Faith against *Nestorius*, and against *Dioscorus* and the *Eutychians*. [In a word, she owns all the Creeds and Doctrines, and condemns all the Heresies and Hereticks, that are recited own'd, and condemned in *lib. i. tit. i.* of the Code of *Justinian* the Emperor, who flourished in this Century] and hath retained the Creed, commonly called the Creed of *St. Athanasius*, as a most familiar and edifying form of Confession, comprehending all the other Confessions, and more particularly illustrating the mysteries of three Persons in one Nature of the Holy Trinity, and of two Natures in one Person of Christ, against the foresaid Heresies and Enemies of the Christian Faith, though it be not of so ancient a date as your Writers say it is. This One Catholick and Apostolick Faith professed, † explained and defended in these Creeds and Confessions, was transmitted from the VIth to the VIIth Century pure and entire, in the beginning of which *Augustin* the Monk propagated the Christian Faith in *England*. And therefore I assert, Secondly, that 900 Years before our separation from your Church in 656, the whole Catholick Church, and particularly the Church of *England*, then professed the Religion which we profess now, and no other. This is evident from the Confessions extant in that Century, as that of the Council of *Sevil*, A. D.

† Διὰ τὸ το γερμανικὸν ὡς ἔλεγε τὸ αὐτὸ μὲν μαθηματικὸν εἶδος ἡμεῖς. ὅτι αἱ τοὶ παλαιοὶ καθολικαὶ ἐκείνην, Sic Cod. lib. i. Tit. i. vii.

619. That of the 4th Council of *Toledo* 633. That of the 6th Council of *Toledo* 638. That of the Council of *Lateran* 649, against all the Enemies of the Faith from *Paulus Samosatenus*, to *Sergius* Bishop of *Constantinople*. That of the Council of *Chalon* 663. That of the XIth Council of *Toledo* 675. That at *Rome* under Pope *Agatho*, in the Cause of *Wilfrid* 679, or rather 680. That of the VIth Oecumenical Council of *Constantinople* 681, against the *Monothelites*, which in its first Canon declares that no Innovation was to be made in the Apostles Creed, that the Nicene Creed was *perfect*, and the Constantinopolitan inviolable, and lastly that of the XIVth Council of *Toledo* 684.

II. ALL these Confessions are found together with those mentioned before in one of your own Epitomisers of the Councils, *Gregor. de Rives*, under the title of *Confessiones Fidei Catholicae*. And the Title of the Book is, *Epitome Canonum Conciliorum*. It was printed at *Lyons* 1663. I say, this one Catholick and Apostolick Faith set forth in the ancient Creeds, and explained and confirmed in the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Creeds, and in the Confessions of the Councils of *Ephesus* and *Chalcedon*, without any addition of new parts, was transmitted pure and entire from the Vth Century to the VIIth, and was that very primitive Catholick Faith, in all its Articles, which we now profess [in the Apostles Creed] and which *St. Augustin* brought to our Saxon Ancestors at the latter end of the VIth Century, and propagated among them in the VIIth. That very † *Word of Life*, as *Bede* calls it. The word of God declaring the Redemption of Mankind,

† *Bed. Ecol. Histor. gentis Angl. Edit. Cantabr. p. 76.*

by the Sufferings of Jesus, as the ‡ Saxon Homilist expresses it. That || one Faith of all Churches, in the words of St. *Augustin* to Pope *Gregory*. That *Christian Faith* of which that good Pope spoke in his * Letter to King *Ethelbert*. That † *Fides Christi*, which King *Edwin* embraced upon the preaching of *Paulinus*, and the preaching of which is called the preaching of the Gospel by ‡ Pope *Honorius*, in his Letter to *Honorius* Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*. That very Faith which *Theodore* and the Saxon Clergy explained, confirmed, and owned as delivered by the Apostles, in a Synod at *Hatfield*, A. D. DCLXXX. *Bede's Eccl. Hist. lib. 4. cap. 17.* Lastly, That || baptismal Faith, that ancient true Faith, as a Saxon Preacher calls it, in his Sermon upon Baptism, was the Faith, which our Saxon Ancestors received, and we now profess. Their Preachers were wont to celebrate this Faith and the memory of St. *Augustin*, who brought it to them with all respect, calling him the English Apostle, and giving him a * Day of Commemoration in their Calendars, when they used to Preach in commendation of him. Of this Faith they had several Confessions or Creeds: One in Greek at the end of K. *Æthelstan's* Psalter in the *Cottonian* Library: Another, or it may be several others in Latin, which from the first word of it they called the *Credo*, or *Creda*, and we from them the Creed. So the Homilist in a Saxon MS of the *Bodleian* Library, which formerly belonged to the Church of *Worcester*, and

‡ *Bede Eccl. Hist. p. 77.* || *Ibid. pag. 81.* * *Ibid. p. 101, 102.* † *Ibid. p. 143.* ‡ *Ibid. p. 152.* || *Ibid. p. 180.*

* *Geo. Hickesii Grammat. Anglo-Sax. & Mæso-Goth. Edit. in fol. Oxon. p. 205.*

is therefore called † *Codex Wigorniensis*. Leopen men, &c. ' Beloved, understand carefully, as it ' much concerns you, that it is your Duty to know ' your Religion, and learn as every Christian ought ' the *Pater Noster*, and *Credo in Deum*, and if ' you cannot learn them in Latin, then learn them ' in English thus. After which follows a translation of the Lord's Prayer, and after that a paraphractical Version of the Creed for the instruction of the People. But the Confessions most in use among them, were the Apostles Creed, as it is commonly called, and which they called the *lesse* Creed, and the Nicene, or CP. Creed, which they called the *Messe-Creed*; because it was used at the Celebration of the *Masse*, or holy Eucharist. Both which you may see in *Bede's Ecclesiastical History*, of the *Cambridge Edition*, p. 496. The Nicene Creed is also to be seen in *Norman-Saxon English* before the beginning of the *Liber Wigorniensis*, which was written after the Conquest, as appears from the *Decreta Normanorum Episcoporum* in it, for hitherto there were no other Creeds or Confessions of Faith in the English Church. In these Creeds they taught the Faith pure and entire to their Catechumens, without adding new parts, as may be seen in a famous Saxon Sermon or Exposition, entituled, *De Fide Catholica*, in the *Bodleian Library*, N E. F. 4. 11. The greater part of which you may read with a Latin Translation, in *Bede's Ecclesiastical History*, set forth by Mr. *Wheloc*, p. 41, &c. and the rest at p. 420. and

† See my short Cabal of Saxon MSS. p. 141. at the end of my *Institutiones Gram. Anglo-Saxonicae*. Or Mr. *Wanley's* compleat and accurate Catal. being the 11th Vol. of the Work, entituled, *Antiqua Literatura Septentrionalis Libri duo*, &c.

in p. 422. There is another excellent Saxon Sermon, in which you may see the Doctrine of our Ancestors, concerning Prayer, Faith and Repen-
 tance, which is the very same we now teach. And in this, and the Sermon *De Fide Catholica*, as the *Lord's Prayer* is proposed for the *Rule of Prayer*: So the Creed is spoken of as the *Rule of Faith*. *Ælc Cnizen Man, &c.* Every Christian ought rightly to understand his *Pater Noster*, and his Creed. By his *Pater Noster*, he shall pray; and confirm, and edifie his Faith by the Creed. I have formerly discoursed upon the *Pater Noster*, and now I proceed to explain to you the Faith that is in the Creed. To the same purpose *K. Cnut* speaks in his Ecclesiastical Laws, where he ordains, that every one should learn the *Lord's Prayer*, as a *Rule of Prayer*, and the *Apostles Creed*, as a *Confession of the right Faith*. And long before him *Bede* in his Epist. to *Ecgbert*, desired of him to charge his Clergy to teach the People the *Apostles Creed*, and the *Lord's Prayer* in *English*, and saith he had translated them into *English* himself, and given Copies of his Translations to several of the Clergy. From all which it is plain that that Discourse was made to the *Catechumens* and others who needed to be instructed in the Christian Faith, and if there were any other Canon of Faith, any other Confessions or Explanations of it, than those above-mentioned, or any other Doctrines or Articles to be believed firmly and constantly by all Men, as necessary to Salvation, it is strange that to that Age, and much longer, they should never be taught to the English *Catechumens* or People, in the Discourses which their Bishops and Priests made to them, on purpose to instruct them in the nature of the one holy Catholick Faith

Faith. There is another Saxon Homily, *De Fide Catholica*, not inferiour to the former, at the end of *Bede's History of Wheloc's Edition*, which also shews the Faith our Ancestors professed. And as the one primitive Faith once delivered to the Saints, was conveyed pure and entire from the Vth to the VIth, and from the VIth to the VIIth Century : So was it conveyed from the VIIth Century pure and entire ; and therefore to shew you I was not afraid or unwilling to answer your Challenge, I assert in the third place, that the whole Catholick Church professed the same pure Faith and Religion which we now profess, without foreign mixture or additions, to the second Council of *Nice*, i. e. to the Year 787. and the Church of *England* professed the same pure and entire to the end of the VIIIth Century, which was but 750 Years before our separation from your Church.

III. THAT Council was the first which suffered the old Confessions of Faith to be corrupted with new additions or parts : For in the form of * Confession, drawn up by *Basil Bishop of Ancyra*, after confessing God the Father, and his only begotten Son Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit, Lord and Giver of Life, and the Consubstantial and Coeternal Trinity, worshipped and glorified in one Godhead and Power, and the whole Oeconomy of the one holy Trinity, and of our Lord and God Jesus Christ, as the six holy Oecumenical Councils had taught the same, and anathematizing all Heresies, that they anathematized ; Then immediately follows a Confession and Acknowledgment of the intercession of the Virgin *Mary*, and of all the heavenly Powers, and all

* Ταύτω τῇ ἐγχεσθόν με ὁμολογίαν ποιῶμαι.

the S
their
shipp
gin, a
Mart
form
Coun
do-Syn
mages
of the
Confe
theref
of Mi
all tha
stians,
ply th
latry,
then it
assent
Soul an
tation
depart
anather
Ghost,
This
the Co
solved
Session,
same p

† As the Sick,

‡ With
to shew th
with all m
and that b
Judgment

* Ταύτ
|| Confili

the Saints, and of † honouring and worshipping their Relicks, and of embracing, saluting and worshipping the Images of Christ, and of the holy Virgin, as also of the ‡ holy Apostles, Prophets, and Martyrs, and Saints; and then after a solemn form of renouncing and anathematizing the VIIth Council at *Constantinople*, which is called a *Pseudo-Synod*, for reproaching the *holy venerable* Images, and commanding them to be taken out of the Churches, it follows: These things * I *Confess* in this manner, and assent unto them, and therefore in simplicity of Heart, and orthodoxy of Mind, as God is my Witness, I anathematize all that here follow: The Calumniators of Christians, who break down Images. Those who apply the Texts of Scripture, which are against Idolatry, against the venerable Images, &c. And then it follows. *These things I thus confess and assent unto them, and declare with all my Heart, Soul and Mind, and if at any time by the Temptation of the Devil, I voluntarily or involuntarily depart from what I have here professed, let me be anathematized from the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and from the Holy Catholick Church.*

This Confession, and others of the like Nature, the Council commended and approved, and absolved those who made them; and in their fourth Session, || made one in the same strain, and to the same purpose, too long to be here set down.

† As the Champions of Christ, who received Grace to heal the Sick, cast out Devils, &c.

‡ With this exception, *ὡς Θεοί*, &c. not as Gods, but to shew the love, and affection, I had for them, and to ask with all my Soul that they would intercede with God for me, and that by their Intercessions I may find Mercy in the Day of Judgment.

* Ταῦτα ἕως ὁμολογεῖναι τέτοις συνάλαλθεμι, &c.

|| *Consiliorum Labb. & Cossert. Tom. vii. p. 318, 319, 320.*

It is well known what success this Council had in the *East*, by the great Zeal and powerful endeavours of the Empress *Irene*; but in a great part of the *West*, its Decrees met not with the like entertainment, particularly in the Kingdom of the *Franks*, under *Charles* the Great. For after the Legates of Pope *Adrian* brought the Acts of that Council into the *West*, that learned King, for as yet he was not Emperor, called a Synod of all the Bishops of *Italy*, *France*, and his other Dominions at *Franckfort*, on the *Main*, in the Year 794. but seven Years after that second Council of *Nice*, with the consent of Pope *Adrian*, who sent his Legates thither. In this Council, the second Council of *Nice*, and its Decrees for worshipping Images, were condemned, as our Writers have shewed you again and again out of the *Opus Capitulare* of that Prince, and particularly Dr. *John Forbes* in the XIth Chapter of the VIIth Book of his learned Work entituled, *Instructiones Historico-Theologicae*, printed at *Amsterdam* MDCXLV.

It was also condemned and anathematized by a Council at *Constantinople*, under the Emperor *Leo Armenius*, which called it a *Pseudo-Synod*, and damned the Adoration of Images in the IXth Century, viz. in the Year 814. It was condemned again in the Year 825, by a † Synod at *Paris*, in the time of *Ludovicus Pius*, Emperor of the *West*, and *Michael Balbus*, Emperor of the *East*, who sent some Divines about that Controversie to *Ludovicus*, and not only this second Synod of *Nice*, and its Doctrines of worshipping Images, was rejected by them, but two Epistles of Pope

† *Apud Melchiorum Goldastum in Collect. Consist. Imperialium Tom. I.*

Adrian
Error
Conj
ges,
seco
how
Ger
ratic
stori
who
'nod
'vit
'act
'Ang
'Hov
'stor
'ab I
'rum
'a Co
'dole
'tran
'Orie
'toru
'asser
're :
'quod
'divin
'illam
'rum
'attul
From
the ju
at tha
ges, v
† De
See also
Ec.

Adrian the First were condemned by them, as Erroneous, viz. the Epistle which he wrote to *Constantinus* and *Irene* for the Adoration of Images, and that which he wrote in defence of the second Nicene Council to *Charles* the Great. And how the Church of *England* agreed then with the German and Gallican Churches against the Adoration of Images, may be seen from our own Historians, as Arch-Bishop *Usher* hath observed, whose words I shall † here transcribe:—*Synodus illa λησεμνη, quæ septimæ Nomen usurpavit pro imaginum Cultu stabiliendo Nicææ Coacta, de qua quid Ecclesiæ Britannicæ senserint, Anglorum Historici Simon Dunelmensis, Rogerius Hovedenus, Mathæus Florilegus, & Roffensis Historiæ Anthor hunc in modum referunt. In anno ab Incarnatione Dom. 792. Carolus Rex Francorum misit Synodalem librum ad Britanniam (sibi a Constantinopoli directum) in quo (libro pro dolor) multa inconvenientia & veræ fidei Contraria reperta sunt: Maxime quod pene omnium Orientalium Doctorum (non minus quam trecentorum, vel eo amplius Episcoporum) unanima assertione Confirmatum est Imagines adorari debere: quod omnino Ecclesia Dei execratur. Contra quod scripsit Alcuinus, & Epistolam ex auctoritate divinarum Scripturarum mirabiliter affirmatam, illamque cum eodem libro ex persona Episcoporum, & Principum nostrorum Regi Franciæ attulit.*

From which words, Sir, it is plain, first that the judgment of the English Church, or Churches at that time was against the Adoration of Images, which they counted Execrable. Secondly,

† De Christiana Ecclesiarum Successione & Statu. Cap. 11. 4. See also Hen. Spelman. Concilia. Vol. 1. in Anno 792. p. 395. &c.

That Alcuin our Countryman wrote an Epistle, in which he proved from the Holy Scriptures, that it was unlawful. Thirdly, That the Kings and Bishops of England approved that Epistle, and authorized him to offer it in their Names to Charles the Great, King of the Franks, who called the Council of Francfort and entertained Alcuin to assist him in that Council. Sir, I have shewed you all this to prove my Assertion above, that the Church of England kept the ancient Faith pure and entire, without [foreign] additions or additional Confessions to the end of the VIIIth Century, and particularly from the additional Confession of the second Council of Nice, especially as to the Adoration of Images, and by consequence that the Faith and the Religion of the Church of England now is the same it was then, or that the Bishops, Kings and Writers (particularly Alcuin, who was Bede's Scholar) and Churches of England then professed our Religion; and I Challenge you to shew, that they then professed yours, that is the Papal part of your Religion, from which we have reformed.

IV. YOU must give me leave also to observe from the Authorities cited above out of Archbishop Usher, that the English Church rejected † the other new Doctrines of the second Council of Nice, as the Intercession and Invocation of Saints, particularly of the blessed Virgin, and Adoring their Relicks; and accordingly the reading of the XLII Canon of the Council of Francfurt, in the ‡ MS of Claudius Puteanus's Library is not as in Labbey's and Cossartius's Edition, ut

† In quo libro (proh dolor!) multa inconvenientia & vera Fidei contraria reperta sunt—

‡ Vita, & Opera Alcuini ex edit. Andrea Quercetani Parisiis, 1617. p. 1890.

nulli novi Sancti colantur, aut invocentur, &c. but *ut nulli nobis Sancti colantur, aut invocentur*; after which it follows, *nec memoria eorum per vias erigantur. Sed hi soli sunt venerandi* (not *colendi aut invocandi*) *aut memoria eorum per vias erigenda, qui electi sunt ex autoritate passionum, & vitæ merito.* The Canon thus read plainly distinguishes *Veneratio* from *Cultus* and *Invocatio*, and accordingly the title of the Canon, which is the XLIII in the *Putean MS.* is *Quinam Sancti in Ecclesia venerandi sunt.* For there is a Veneration due to Martyrs, and pious Confessors, which consists in commemorating their Courage, Constancy, and Sufferings; in always speaking with respect and reverence of them; in declaring to the World their noble acts of Patience, Charity, and Humility, and Love, and Beneficence to their Enemies, and in erecting publick Statues, and Monuments, as of other Hero's, in remembrance of them. In this chaste sense you know, Sir, *Cicero* saith, *habet venerationem justam quicquid excellit*, and that this is a common Latin Phrase *memoriam alicujus venerari.* This is all the Veneration to this time, and some time longer, that our Ancestors of the English Church shew'd to Saints, without any *Cult* or Invocation or Adoration of their Images. For in all the rude Pictures we find in their MSS, that remain among us, there are none, that I ever observed, made for Adoration, except one of our Lord with St. *Dunstan* prostrate at his Feet, which I have printed in my *Saxon Grammar*, p. 145, and which the hand of the Inscription proves to have been made about the time of the Conquest. Had they embraced the Adoration of Images, they would in probability have had better Pictures. But they us'd at least to the Xth Century to speak chastly

of their Saints. Accordingly, in a *Harmony of the four Gospels*, or rather a *History of Jesus Christ made out of them all*, written about the time of *Charles the Great* in the *Francick Tongue*, and extant in the *Cottonian Library*, Caligula A. VII. I. There are no Appellations, or Titles given to the *Virgin Mary*, but what any Protestant will allow may be given her, especially in a *Poetical Writing*, as that Book is. And in a *Poetical Calendar* written in the *Dano-Saxonick Tongue*, which I have published in the XXIII Chapter of my *Anglo-Saxonick Grammar*, she is plainly called *Mary*; from whence I think it not unreasonable to infer, that in the Ages in which those Books were written, the Invocation of Saints and Adoration of their Images were either in none, or very little use among the *Franks*, or *English-Saxons*, and by consequence not yet established by Ecclesiastical or Regal Authority among either of them. But, Sir, to conclude my Answer to your Challenge, I assert that we have the same Faith and Religion, that *Pope Gregory the Great* sent to our Ancestors without addition, or alteration; for what he professed was his Faith, we profess now. I shall faithfully translate his Confession, as I find it in *Garnerius's Notes* upon the 11th Chapter of *Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum*, published by him at *Paris*, M. DC. LXX.

I believe in one Almighty God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, three Persons, One Substance: The Father unbegotten, the Son begotten, the Holy Ghost neither begotten, nor unbegotten, but Coeternal, proceeding from the Father and the Son. I confess the only begotten Consubstantial Son, born of his Father before all time, Creator of all things, visible and invisible, Light of light,

light.
Glor
the
Man
born
took
unde
the t
rieth
of th
the q
cret
the
ven
Puni
by F
fess
Univ
of St
and
his C
This
Auth
Holy
clear
conti
resie
num
Al
Conf
to th
title

† L
cam q
morem
rio An
Antioc

light, very God of very God, the brightness of his Glory, the Character of his Substance, who being the Word before all Worlds, was created perfect Man towards the end of the World, conceived, and born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, he took our Nature without Sin, and was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and was buried, and rose the third day from the dead, and ascended the fortieth day into Heaven, and sits at the right hand of the Father, from whence he will come to judge the quick and the dead, and will lay open the secret of every Man before all Men, and will give the everlasting Rewards of the Kingdom of Heaven to the Righteous, but to the Unrighteous the Punishments of eternal Fire, and renew the World by Fire, and the Resurrection of the Body. I confess one Faith, one Baptism, one Apostolical and Universal Church, in which only there is remission of Sins, in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Of this Confession before his Consecration, *Johannes Diaconus* saith thus, *This Man of Consummat Humanity, and Orthodox Authority, standing on the Watch-Tower of the Holy Universal Church, from whence he might be clearly seen and heard as a Preacher of the Gospel, confirmed the right Faith, and confounded all Heresies with one Creed in these words, Credo in Unum Deum, &c.*

After his Consecration, he sent a Synodical Confession of Faith, according to ancient Custom, to the other † Patriarchs (for he abhorred the title of Universal Bishop) in these words; Be-

† *Lib. diurn. Appendix ad Notas Cap. II. p. 159. Synodicam quoque suam Gregorius, secundum priscum decessorum suorum morem Johanni Constantinopolitano, Eulogio Alexandrino, Gregorio Antiocheno, Joanni Hierosolymitano, & Anastasio Patriarchæ Antiocheno destinavit.*

cause with the Heart Man believeth unto Righteousness, and with the Mouth Confession is made unto Salvation, as I confess to receive and reverence the four Books of the Holy Gospel; so I confess I receive and reverence four Councils, viz. the Nicene in which was confounded the wicked Doctrine of Arius; the Constantinopolitan, in which was convicted the Error of Eunomius and Macedonius; the Ephesian, in which was condemned the impious Doctrine of Nestorius; and that of Chalcedon, in which the naughty Doctrine of Eutyches and Dioscorus was rejected, I embrace with all Devotion, and observe with entire Approbation, because on these Councils the Structure of the Holy Faith is erected, as on a four-square Stone, and the right Rule of every Christian's Life and Action consists in them. In like manner, I also reverence the fifth Council, in which the Epistle, which is called the Epistle of Ibas, being full of Error is rejected, and Theodorus, who taught that there were two Persons in the Mediator between God and Man in the two Natures is convicted to have lapsed into perfidious Impiety. Also the Writings of Theodore, in which the Faith of St. Cyrill is reprehended. Furthermore, I reject all Persons whom those venerable Councils reject, and those whom they reverence I embrace, because they being established by Universal Consent, he destroys himself and not them; whosoever presumes either to loose whom they bind, or bind whom they loose. And whosoever thinks otherwise, let him be Anathema.

This Vth General Council determined all things out of the Holy Scriptures and the Fathers. They owned the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Creeds. They received the four first General Councils, and all their definitions *pro una eademque Fide*, in defence

defe
the
by
Yea
still
the
and
Ant
Syn
shop
fesse
our
we
form
secu
Diu
and
ber
of
reno

‡
Paul
pravi
dogm
rius
Coun
Phar
Anat
Here
favo
tion
to th
And
Thess
in th
who
verec
he h
plina

defense of *one and the same Faith*. That one and the same Faith, which *Gregory* sent into *England* by *Augustin* the Monk, between 900 or 1000 Years ago, we professed at the Reformation, and still profess it. And therefore in naming *Gregory* the Great, who was both a Bishop, and a Writer, and the Patriarchs of *Constantinople*, *Alexandria*, *Antioch* and *Hyerusalem*, to whom he sent his Synodical Confession, I think I have named Bishops, Writers, and Churches enough, who professed our Religion 900, or 1000 Years before our Separation from your Church. Nay, Sir, we own and profess every thing in that excellent form of Confession, before Consecration, intituled, *secunda professio Fidei*, in the IX. Tit. of *Liber Diurnus*, which was made between the Years 685 and 715, ‡ and in which Pope *Honorius* is number'd among the Hereticks; and to use the words of it *Cognoscat vestra dilectio*. Let your Reverence know and be assured, that we preach and

‡ *Auctores vero novi Heretici dogmatis Sergium, Pyrrhum, Paulum, & Petrum, Constantinopolitanos, una cum Honorio qui pravis eorum assertionibus fomentum impendit—qui heretica dogmata contra veritatem fidei Synodaliter decreverunt.* *Honorius* was anathematized as an Heretick by the sixth General Council. Θεοδώρου αἰρετικοῦ, &c. Anathema to *Theodorus Pharanita* the Heretick; Anathema to *Sergius* the Heretick; Anathema to *Honorius* the Heretick; Anathema to *Cyrus* the Heretick; Anathema to *Pyrrhus* the Heretick; Anathema to all favourers of Hereticks. He is anathematized again in the Oration they made to the Emperor, and by Pope *Leo* in his Epistle to the Emperors, which is at the end of the Acts of that Synod. And how can the Pope of *Rome*, saith *Neilus* Archbishop of *Thessalonica*, like a Tyrant, pretend to be unaccountable? When in the case of Doctrine *Honorius* is an example to the contrary, who by the judgment of the sixth General Council, was delivered up to an Anathema. From which at the time of Death he had not Absolution. See *Du Pin de Antiqua Ecclesie disciplina Dissert. V. §. iii.*

bold,

bold, and defend with entire satisfaction, the Faith of Christ, which the Apostles delivered, the Disciples of the Apostles taught, and their Apostolical Successors, our approved Predecessors immutably kept, and defended. To which let me add these words: *Unde & districti anathematis interdictioni subjecimus, &c.* If any Person, whether I, or any other, presume to alter this Evangelical Tradition (of the first six General Councils) or the entireness of the right Faith and Christian Religion by attempting any new thing, or any thing contrary thereunto, or to substract from the entireness of our Faith, or to consent to those, who with sacrilegious boldness presume to do so; we subject him to the sentence of an Anathema, i. e. to be separated from the Communion of the Catholick Church.

We likewise own and profess what is contained there, in the third profession of Faith to be made after Consecration, of the same Age with the former: *Orthodoxæ atque Apostolicæ fidei Normam tenentes*, holding the rule of right Apostolical Faith, *& nunquam aliquid novi contra Catholicam, atque Orthodoxam Fidem suscepturi*, and resolving never to receive any new additions against the true Catholick Faith. To these Confessions we appeal in the Controversie between you and us, and let it be tryed by them, whether your Religion, or ours, is an *Innovation*; and whether ours was not professed by the Church of God, and its Bishops, Writers and Congregations 900, or 1000 Years before our Separation from your Church, when I challenge you again to shew any Bishops, Writers, or Churches, that professed yours.

C H A P. IV.

HAVING now answered your Challenge, I proceed to answer the rest of your Reply, which is like all that I have already answered, verbose, ambiguous and cavilling. The ground of your Query, as you call your Supposition, was penned in these words: *Supposing this for true, that the Church of Christ can never perish*; where I desired to know what you meant by *perish*? For *perish*, I said, might either signify that the Church may be quite destroyed, so as to have no being in the World, as it had not before it began to be; or secondly, that it may signifie only not to be the same Church, as to Doctrine, Worship or Polity, which was founded by Christ, and finished by the Apostles, but to be corrupted (*I now desire to add miserably corrupted*) in one, or all those parts of its Constitution; so that it ceases to be a sound, right constituted, or Apostolical Church, being so depraved in one, or more, or all the parts of its Constitution, that a Catholick, or truly faithful Christian cannot communicate in it without Sin. To perish in the former signification I told you, was for the Church to perish in a *metaphysical sense*; but to perish in the latter, was to perish in a *moral sense*; and this distinction which is plain and obvious to any common Understanding, you do not disallow, but only endeavour to shew it is impertinent. I am forced to follow you in the Chace you lead me, and therefore to my great loss of time must transcribe the words in which you reply, that I may make distinct answers to them. *I appeal* (say you in your second Paragraph) *to any Di-*
vine,

vine, whether the words of the Proposition (*Supposing this for true that the Church of Christ can never perish*) be not clear; and I appeal, Sir, to any Divine, whether your Hypothetical Proposition would not have been more clear in these words: *Supposing this for true that the Church of Christ can quite perish, so as to cease to be a Church*; or in these, *Supposing this for true that the Church of Christ may be quite destroyed, so as to have no being*. If it would have had a more clear and determined sense in these, or the like words, then it was not clear in yours, because they did not determine the sense, in which *perish* was to be taken, that is to say, in the metaphysical, or in the moral sense. Then you proceed, *He desires to know what the word perish means*. I answer, *to perish is to cease to be, to lose the Essence the thing had before it perished*. I think, Sir, you should have said to lose the Existence it had before it perished. But to let that pass, I answer in the other sense of the word, *to perish also in common usage of speech*, signifies to cease to be in the same good State and Condition, that a thing was in before, or to lose those good Qualities and Perfections natural, or moral, according to the Nature of the thing, in which its excellency, or goodness did consist. A Man (say you) *perishes, when he dyes, because he ceases to be a Man*; and a Man (I say) also *perishes when he becomes extremely vitious, because he abandons humane Nature, and ceases to be a virtuous Man*. Thus in our own Language we speak properly, when we say *Vice destroys a Man, before he dyes*, or a Man is undone by Vice before his Death. So the French say of a dissolute profligate Man, *C'est un Homme perdu*, as the Latins call such an one *Homo perditus*. It is Cicero's

own

own phrase for a wicked Fellow. So he saith of a young Man that was past all hopes of being reclaimed, that he was *perditus* & *dissolutus* *Adolescens*, and of a pack of desperate Rogues, *Nihil est perditius his hominibus*. So in the Greek speaks *Demosthenes* ἀπὸ τῶν τῆς κακίας ἀπολαμβάνων ἀνθρώπων, *ab istis perditissimis hominibus*. So *Aristophanes* in *Pluto*: Σὺ γὰρ ὦ κακίς ἀπολαμβάνῃ τι λουσώρεϊς, *O perditissima quid Tu convitiaris*. Thus *Luk. xv. 24, 32*. The words of Death and Destruction are applied to the Prodigal, tho' he was alive, νεκρὸς ὡς καὶ ἀνέζησε, καὶ ἀπολωλὸς ὡς &c. *Filius hic meus mortuus erat! & revixit, perierat & inventus est*. And so τὸ ἀπολωλὸς is expounded *Matth. xviii. 11. Luke xix. 10. Venit Filius hominis quærere, & saluum facere quod perierat: The Son of Man came to seek and save that which was lost*. And so it signifies in other places, as *Matth. x. 6. John xvii. 12. ii Cor. iv. 3*. Perish is a *Nutropassive Verb* in our Language, as *pereo* in Latin, and they signifie as *perdior* in that Language, and ἔλλυμι or ἀπόλλυμι in the Greek; and I believe there is no Language, wherein the words of Destruction are not familiarly used of Things and Persons, when they are altered for the worse, beyond hopes of amendment, or when those Virtues and Qualities perish, wherein their (natural or moral) excellency did consist, tho' they retain their being. Thus we also say of a Man, who hath lost the use of his Reason and Memory, that he is dead, or hath out-lived himself. *Moses* counted *Miriam* as dead, when she was struck with the Leprosie, *Numbers xii. 12*. And thus in our Language we say of strong Liquors, that they are dead, or perished, when their strength only perishes; and of Flowers, that they are perished, when their

Odour

Odour, and Beauty only is gone. Then it follows in your words : *This is the evident, common, and obvious meaning of the word*; and the other, as I have shew'd, is as evident, common and obvious, as that. Then immediately it follows again, *But*, says he, *the word perish may be taken in a moral sense, to mean, for example, that the Church perishes, when it ceases to be a sound well constituted Church.* It is true, I said it, and now stand to it, that the Church may be said to perish, in a *moral sense*, when it ceases to be a sound Church in one, or more parts of its Constitution, to such a degree of depravation and corruption, that a faithful Christian cannot communicate in it without Sin, tho' it retains its being, and continues to be a real Church. Sir, I use the word *real* rather than *true*, to take away the ambiguity of the phrase, *true Church*; and I pray you to observe it, because it will save me some labour hereafter in distinguishing the metaphysical, from the moral signification of *true*, which when joyned with *Church* may signifie a *real*, or a *right* Church. Then it follows; *Suppose this were true, it is nothing to his purpose, for words are always to be taken in their proper signification, unless there be some good reason to the contrary.* Whether it was to my purpose, or no, to say that *perish* may be taken in a moral sense, for the Church's ceasing to be a sound Church, to such a degree that a faithful Christian cannot communicate in it without Sin, shall be seen in the process of my Answer. And whether there was not a good reason to say that *perish* might be taken in this, which I acknowledge is not the *proper*, if by proper you mean the literal, but the *figurative*, or *tropical sense*, I appeal to what I have already said, as to the common and obvious sense of

of the word in all Languages, wherein Things and Persons depraved and corrupted in a mighty degree (*tho' they retain their being*) are properly said to be perished and destroyed, as *properly* signifies *aptly*, and in common use of Speech. Nay, this tropical sense of the word *perish*, is of the two the more common in Speech; and this I assign for a good reason, why I desired to know what you meant by *perish*, when you supposed it for true, that the Church of Christ cannot perish. Secondly, *You say it is absolutely false that the Church may be said to perish, whilst it retains every thing essential to the Constitution of a true Church.* Here, Sir, I joyn with you, if by a *true Church*, you mean a *right Church*. For a *right Church*, is a *sound Church*. But a *sound Church* indeed, while it remains such, cannot be said to perish in either sense, because it retains not only its being, but its purity and soundness, whereof the latter makes it to be a *right*, as the former, to be a *real Church*. But if by a *true Church*, you mean a *real Church*, then I must say your *assertion is absolutely false*, because as a Man retains his being, tho' he be ruined in his Intellectuals, or Morals, and thereby undone in a tropical sense; so a Church depraved and corrupted to that miserable degree, which I have mentioned, may be said to perish in a moral, which is a tropical sense, tho' it retains its being, and remains a *real Church*. Thus the Jewish Church, which was the Church of Christ under the Law, when it was corrupted to that degree, that God, as it were, looked upon it, *as no Church*, yet retained its being and relation to him, and remained his Church still, as you will give me opportunity to shew. But then in your sophistical way you offer some semblance of reason, why a Church *can-*
not

not be said to perish, whilst it retains the Essentials of a true Church, tho' it is unsound in some part of it, because a Man cannot be said to perish, when he loses a Finger, or falls sick. Pray, Sir, is there no difference between an *integral*, and an *essential* part? The Church, of which I affirm, that it may be truly said to perish, is a Church, which is so miserably depraved and vitiated in Doctrine, Worship or Polity, which are the essential parts of its Constitution, that a true Catholick cannot lawfully communicate with it, by reason of those Corruptions; and such a Church may in common usage of speech be said to perish in a tropical sense, tho' it retains those Essentials, because it retains them so corrupted and depraved. In like manner, as a Man who hath lost the health of his Body, and the soundness of his Mind, is (in common usage of speech aptly) said to be *lost, gone, undone, ruin'd*, nay not to *be himself*, tho' in that miserable state he retains the Essentials of his Constitution, because he retains them so corrupted, and depraved. And then as to your similitude of *falling sick*, I must tell you that there is a great difference in Patients, and great diversity in the kinds and degrees of Sickness. Some Patients are willing to be cured, and some are so obstinate and opiniatre, that they will not admit any means of Cure. Some are affected in a few, and those the less noble, and some in all the most noble and vital parts. Some labour under long, dangerous, grievous and pestilential Diseases, and some of Distempers, which soon go off, and in which there is no danger to the sick Person, nor to others by infection from him. Now to set my Similitude against yours; I believe Sir, speaking in any Language of such a sick Person as had a long, most dangerous

dangerous, noysome and infectious Distemper in all his most noble and vital parts, and withall was not sensible of his Disease, or the great danger of it, nor could be perswaded to submit to a Cure: I say, Sir, speaking of such a Person, I believe you would make no difficulty to say he was in a desperate *perishing* Condition; that he was a *lost, dead, undone* Man. Sir, there is, and hath been for a long time, a very morbid Church in the World, of which such a sick Person is not an unfit Emblem. Like the Church of *Judah* and *Jerusalem*, *Isaiah* 1. 6. There is no sound part in her, either Integral, or Essential. From the Head to the Sole of the Foot, from the Metropolis to the meanest Parish, in Doctrine, Worship and Government, she is full of Corruption, and purrid Sores. The Writers of her own Communion have complain'd grievously of her, and called her by names I will not mention, and tho' she doth not cease to be a Church, and so is not perished in the *literal* Sense, yet because for many Ages she hath ceased to be a sound and right Church, she hath *perished* from what she was, and destroyed her self in the *tropical sense*, which is a very common, and usual sense of the word.

II. THEN you go on in these words; *when he will allow that every Man perishes, that falls into a puddle, and dirties himself, then I will allow this exception of his to be pertinent.* By this exception, I suppose you mean my distinction of perishing in a metaphysical, and in a moral sense, the former of which is the literal, and the latter the figurative, but not the less apt or proper use of the word. But now, Sir, I have not said any thing to imply that a clean Man perishes in any sense, when he grows dirty; you may make me speak impertinently, and absurdly when you please

by misrepresenting what I say : and so you have done by one expression in my Answer to your Challenge, *Name your Bishops, Writers, Churches, nay, one single Congregation of Protestants for 900 or 1000 Years before your Separation, &c.* I told you this was an absurd, and unreasonable demand, because you asked us to shew reformed Protestant Bishops, Writers and Churches, before there were any Protestants, that is before the Reformation, and that you might as well have bid us name our Protestant Kings and Courts before *Edward the VIth*, or ask a sloven where his clean Face was so many days before it was washed. But you are so ingenuous, as to extend my Similitude not only beyond, but to a purpose contrary to that, for which I brought it. Then it follows in words to the same effect, and as little to the purpose. *In the mean time let him reflect, that in case the Church had been unsound, that doth not amount to perishing, but only to being depraved, nor in such Case had she lost her self (which is to perish) but only her Beauty, or her sound Constitution.* But, Sir, when a Church becomes so unsound, corrupt and depraved in any, or all the essential parts of its Constitution, that it ceases to be a right constituted Church, and that a truly Catholick Christian cannot communicate in her without Sin, when she is unsound to such an intolerable degree, then she loses her self with the soundness of her Constitution, and like other things, in the like ill condition, is reputed as lost, and properly, *i. e.* aptly said to perish in such a state of Corruption, as drives the Faithful from her Communion, tho' she retains her Being, *i. e.* tho' she still remains a depraved, and corrupt Church.

III. THEN

III. THEN you proceed, saying, *Besides, what imaginable reason had be to think, that I should take the word perish for being unsound, suppose it could be taken so?* That the word *perish* may, nay, is so taken, and used to signifie depravation, or unsoundness in such a degree, as I have described it, is proved by many Instances in several Languages, and that a Church may be said to perish that is so corrupt, as to cease to be Catholick, and of no farther use to the Faithful, I still assert, and the nature of the Controversie which I saw wrapt up in that word, obliged me to take notice of the *tropical*, but very (apt and) common sense of it, especially to an Adversary, who would not have it so taken, because it is his interest to make Men believe, that the *Roman Church*, which he always understands by the *Church of Christ*, cannot perish in that sense, *i. e.* That it cannot lose its Purity and Soundness, and retain its Being, or cease to be a pure, sound, or truly Catholick Church, tho' it doth not cease to be a Church. The Controversial Writers among you do not love this distinction, and you so feel the inconveniences of it, that supposing your Church exclusively of all others to be the *Church of Christ*, you still labour in vain to confound that distinction, by making the two senses of *perish* but one, and thereby absurdly endeavour to prove, against the Nature of a Church, the History of Churches, and common sense, that if your Church was so corrupt, as we pretend, when we reform'd from it, it was not a Church.

CHAP. V.

I. **T**HEN in your third Paragraph you call my other distinction of the larger from the narrower sense, in which the *Church of Christ* is taken, a *cavil and disingenuous trifling* for the same reason, because you do not love it, and you do not love it, because you saw it was made to shew that the Church of Rome was but *a part of the Church of Christ*, and not the *whole*, or universal Church. *His second Cavil* (say you) *is upon these words, the Church of Christ. For* (says he) *she may be taken in two senses; one as large, as Christianity* (and you should have added my other words) *for the whole Universal Church, wheresoever dispersed over the Earth, or for some part of it greater or less* (I added) *comprehending one, or more Churches, but not the Universal Church.* Sir, I must take the liberty to tell you, that you must be a Man of very great assurance, to say that this distinction, which is so common in Ecclesiastical Writers in all Languages, is a cavil, and trifling, and false. For to begin with the Holy Scriptures, it is used in both senses therein. First, for the Universal Church, or whole Body of Christ's Church, as *Eph. i. 22, 23. and gave him (i. e. Christ) over all things to the Church, which is his Body, the fulness of him, that filleth all in all.* The vulgar Latin, or Version of your Church, hath it, *ipsum dedit Caput super omnem Ecclesiam*, and gave him to be the Head over all the Church, which is as large as Christianity; and † *St. Ignatius*, who first

† *Epist. ad Smyrneneses.*

used the phrase of *Καθολικὴ Ἐκκλησία*, or *Universal Church*, useth it in the same sense, for the whole Christian Church, dispersed over the whole World, of which Christ is the only Head: ὅπερ ἀνὴρ Φανὴ Ἐπίσκοπος, ἐκεῖ τὸ πλῆθος ἔστω. ὡσαύτως ὅπερ ἀνὴρ ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ ἱησοῦς, ἐκεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία. *Ubi apparet Episcopus illic Multitudo* (Congregatio) sit, *quemadmodum ubi est Christus Jesus, illic Catholica Ecclesia*. The sense of which place is this: That the People in every Church are to adhere to their Bishop, who is their visible ministerial Head, as the Universal Church doth adhere to her invisible Head, and Archetypal High Priest, Jesus Christ. But to return to the New Testament, the Church is taken for the Universal Church, Eph. v. 23, 24, 25, 26. *The Husband is the Head of the Wife, even as Christ is the Head of the Church. Therefore as the Church is subject unto Christ, &c. Husbands love your Wives, as Christ loveth the Church and gave himself for it.* To which I might add, Acts ii. 47. Coloss. i. 18, 24. Matth. xvi. 18. 1 Cor. xii. 28. Secondly, It is as familiarly used for some part of the Universal Church, greater or less, as in the following places: *This is he who was in the Church, in the Wilderness. There was a great Persecution of the Church which was at Hierusalem. Tidings of these things came unto the Ears of the Church which was at Hierusalem. Herod stretched forth his hands to vex certain of the Church. Prayer was made without ceasing of the Church unto God for him. Now there was in the Church that was at Antioch—* From Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and called the Elders of the Church. *Take heed to your selves and to all the Flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you Bishops to feed the Church of God* (in Ephesus

and the Regions thereabouts) which he hath purchased with his Blood. Unto the Church of God which is at Corinth. Cause this Epistle to be read in the Church of the Laodiceans. Unto the Church of the Thessalonians. So to Timothy at Ephesus. Let not the Church be charged. If any Man is sick among you, let him call for the Elders of the Church. Unto the Angel of the Church of Ephesus. A Servant of the Church, who is at Cenchrea. Greet the Church that is in their House. Aquila and Priscilla salute you with the Church that is in their House. Thus, Sir, you see the Church, and the Church of God is used both *explicitely* and *implicitely*, to signify the particular Churches of Nations, Provinces and Countries adjacent; nay, of Towns, Villages and Families, which are the least parts of the Universal Church, it is *implicitely* used to signify the Church of *Ancyra*, by *Apollinarius* Bishop of *Hierapolis*, in *Eusebius's* History, *Lib. V. cap. XVI.* Ὡς ἔμ' ἐκκλησίαν, &c. So that the Church (understanding the Church of *Ancyra*) exceedingly rejoiced, and was mightily comforted in the Faith [So the true Church of *Rome* under *Cornelius*, as distinguished from the schismatical Church there under *Novatianus*, is *implicitely* called the Church of Christ by St. Cyprian in his Epistle to Pope *Lucius* upon his return from Banishment: Unde contra Ecclesiam Christi, & Episcopum Cornelium beatum martyrem, vique omnes, sæcularis potestas subito proruperit, ut ad confundendos Hæreticos, & retundendos ostenderet Dominus, quæ esset Ecclesia, quis Episcopus ejus unus divina ordinatione electus; whence the secular Power broke out in a sudden Persecution, against the Church of Christ, and its Bishop, and blessed Martyr *Cornelius*, and against you

you all, that our Lord might shew to the confusion and mortification of the Hereticks, which was his Church, and who was his one Bishop elected by the Appointment of God. I could bring you more Examples out of St. Cyprian, in which the Church, the Church of Christ, the Catholick Church, are taken implicitly, to signifie particular Churches; but I reserve them for another place.] And as for the explicit use of them for particular Churches, nothing is more common, as in St. Clement's Epistle, who was Bishop of Rome, to the Church of Corinth: Ἡ ἐκκλησία τῆ Θεοῦ ἡ παρὸντος Ρώμης τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῆ Θεοῦ παρὸντος Κόρινθου. The Church of God which is at Rome, to the Church of God which is at Corinth. So the * Church of Smyrna, in their Epistle, concerning the Martyrdom of St. Polycarp their Bishop, to the Church of Philomelium: Ἡ ἐκκλησία τῆ Θεοῦ ἡ παρὸντος Σμύρνης, &c. The Church of God which is at Smyrna, to that at Philomelium, and to all the Districts or People of the Catholick Church, Grace, Peace, and the Love of God the Father, and of our Lord Jesus Christ, be multiplied. So † in St. Athanasius's Works, Tom. i. p. 779. Κωνσταντίνῳ μέγιστῳ, σέβας τῷ λαῷ τῷ κατ' Ἀλεξάνδρειαν καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας. Constantine the great Emperour, to the People of the Catholick Church of Alexandria. So in the same Epistle, p. 794. Κατὰ τὴν καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τὴν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, against the Catholick Church in Ægypt. I hope, Sir, you'll allow the Church of God, and the Catholick Church, to signifie the Church of Christ; and then I hope these Examples, without here producing others, which are mentioned in their proper place, make it evident that the Church of Christ, with-

* Euseb. Eccl. Hist. Lib. IV. Cap. XV.

† Edit. Paris. MDCXXVII.

out any Cavil or Trifling, may be taken either *absolutely*, or in *apposition*, [either explicitly or implicitly] for a part of the Universal Church, comprehending one, or more Churches, as well as for the whole, or Universal Church, of which he only is the Head.

II. I HAVE made use of this old, and true Distinction [which is justified by the Learned † Patriarch so often cited by me,] on purpose to force you to discover the Fallacy which you couched in your Supposition; for I knew very well, that by the *Church of Christ* you meant *your own Church*; and that it would put a difficulty upon you how to express your meaning, because if you should say in plain words you meant the *Roman Catholick Church*, then you knew I would reply, that the Roman Catholick Church, so called, was not the whole Universal Church to which the Promise of Indefectibility was made, but a part of it, which might perish, as many other National, Provincial and Diocesan Churches had done, without any failure of the Church of God. But if you should say, you meant the *holy Catholick Church*, or *the one holy Catholick and Apostolick Church*, then you knew I should tell you, that

† Nestarius in his Answer to DOM. PETRE against the Pope's Supremacy, p. 214. *Et hæc proprie dicitur Catholica, & simpliciter Ecclesia Dei.* ——— *Dicitur, & Ecclesia Synecdochice, quod in parte ad totam refertur Ecclesiam, qualia sunt plurima à te prolata, sicut fatetur Apostolus ad Corinthios Scribens, quia persecutus sum Ecclesiam Dei, Maxime enim Hierosolymis, & Damasco etiam tantum insurrexerat contra illas duas Ecclesias, sed intentione contra omnem Catholicam.* — *Tale est quod in 1 ad Tim. cap. 3. ostenditur. Scribo ad te, O Timothee, ut cognoscas quomodo oportet conversari in Ecclesia Dei, quæ est Ecclesia Dei viventis, columna & firmamentum veritatis. Tunc autem conversabatur Timotheus in Ecclesia Ephesi, sed ipsius sancta conversatio, omnem edificabat Ecclesiam.*

the

the Roman Church, when in its purest state, was but a Part, or Member of the one holy Catholick and Apostolick Church, and that now with all the Churches, which are in Communion with it, is but one great and most corrupt Part of the Church of God, as the Church is sometimes taken (*latissime*) in the most large sense of all, for all the Churches, sound or unsound, orthodox or heretical, pure or corrupt, professing the Christian Religion throughout the whole World. This you were aware of, and therefore not liking my Distinction, to either Part of which you could not, you durst not answer plainly and fairly, you grew very angry at it, and gave it the hard Names above-mentioned, though as I have shewed, it is as old, as the Christian Religion. But let us go to your words: *I might pay him in his own Coin, and ask him what he means by Christianity, whether those Faithful only that are baptized, as we mean it, or those that believe in Christ, whether baptized, or no.* If you had pleased, Sir, you might have asked me, whether I meant the Church *Militant*, or *Triumphant*, and it had been as much to the purpose. For if by Believers not baptized, you mean the truly faithful *Catechumens*, who are Candidates of Baptism, they shall be Parts, or not Parts, Members or not Members of the Universal Church of God, by which I explained my sense of Christianity, as you will. But if by Believers not baptized, you mean those pretended Believers who reject Baptism, you know they are no part of the Universal Church of Christ, or truly Catholick Christianity, in my most proper sense of the word. *But, say you, not intending to wait for his Answer, I must tell him that both his Senses are absolutely false.* [Very strange, Sir, that both the general, and special, or particular Sense

Sense of *the Church of Christ* must be false. I must confess I never knew it before. But if indeed they are both false, I must entreat you to shew me the true Sense of those words, or, if you can, any truer Sense of them, than when they are used to signifie either the *universal*, or any *particular* Church of Christ. For if they are falsely used, or abused, when they are used in either of those Senses, I must acknowledge I have long abused, and misapplied them, not only in my Conversation with Men, but in my Prayers to God. Wherefore, Sir, it will be great Charity in you to rectifie this unfortunate Mistake, in which I have so long continued. For if it should be true, as you affirm, that both these Senses of those words are false, that is, that *the Church of Christ* is not truly and properly used, when it is used to signifie the Universal Church, or any part of it, then I cannot conceive, that either the Church universal, or any part of it is the Church of Christ. Sir, you are one of the most singular Adversaries in your way of writing, that I have ever yet had to deal with, both as to your Assertions, and the pretended Proofs of them, as your following words shew :] *And, First, That the Church of Christ is not taken for Christianity,* (you should have added my other words, *viz.* or the whole Universal Church dispersed over the Earth.) *I prove out of their own Definition of the Church in the 19th Article of the 39, which say thus, The Visible Church is a Congregation of faithful Men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be truly administred.* That the Church of Christ, or Church of God, or the Catholick Church, (all which signifie the same thing,) is taken for all Christianity, *viz.* for all pure Catholick, or Orthodox Christianity, I have

proved

prov
tius
I'll
fart
beco
glad
it, t
will
Chu
fals
Chu
mon
or U
tiam
dire
def
Syn
lis,
Bis
To
Ar
fai
the
Wa
bec
to
in
sa
su
fo
sa
So
oi
th
er
fo
o

proved above out of the Scriptures, and St. *Ignatius's* Epistle to the Church of *Smyrna*: But lest I should seem to want proof, I will now prove it farther by uncontestable Authorities, whatever becomes of that Definition of a Church. [And glad I am of an occasion to bring new Proofs of it, though there is no need of them, because they will set the old true Notion of the Catholick Church in its proper light against your new and false Notion of it; and also shew, that your Church in ancient Times, was never esteemed more than a part of the whole Catholick Church, or Universal Church of Christ.] A Synod of Egyptian Bishops being met in Council at *Alexandria* directeth a Circular Letter, which they wrote in defence of their Patriarch *Athanasius*, thus: *The Synod convened from Egypt, Thebais, Pentapolis, and Livia, send Greeting in the Lord to the Bishops of the Catholick Church in all places: Τοῖς ἀπανταχῇ τῇ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπισκόποις.* *Athanasii Apol. in Vol. 1. p. 722.* And St. Cyril saith, *Catech. xviii.* That the Church is called *Catholick*, because it is diffused through the whole World, from one end of the Earth to another; and because it teaches all Doctrines, which Men ought to know, of things visible and invisible, of things in Heaven and in Earth, Catholickly, i. e. Universally, without defect or difference; and because it subdues all sorts of Men, Princes, and private Persons to Religion, and because it cures and universally heals all sorts of Sins both of Body and Soul. So *Theophylact* on 1 Cor. xii. *Καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία, &c.* The Catholick Church dispersed through the whole World, whose Body consists of all Churches every where, having Christ, (not any one Bishop for its Head.) So St. *Athanasius*, *Quest. xxxvii.* of the Parable of the Scripture, *Tom. II. p. 402.*

Ἐκκλησία

Ἐκκλησία καθολικὴ καλεῖται, &c. The Church is called Catholick, because it is dispersed through the whole World. So St. Augustin, Epist. 107. says, *Quod cultus ejus per omnes pene mundi terminos emanavit Catholica vel universalis vocatur Ecclesia*, The Church is called Catholick, or Universal, because its Religion is gone over all the Countries of the World. So Vincentius Lirinensis, Cap. iii. *In ipsa Catholica Ecclesia magnopere curandum est, &c.* We must earnestly take care to hold That in the Catholick Church, which was believed every where, always, and by all. And, Cap. xxv. *Ille est verus & germanus Catholicus, &c.* He is a true and genuine Catholick, who being fix'd and stable in the Faith, holds and believes only that which he knows the Catholick Church in old Times universally held. So our Countryman † Bede, — *Id est, prepararent omnes Ecclesie per orbem, quae unam Catholicam faciunt, panem, & vinum in mysterium carnis & sanguinis Agni immaculati, qui abstulit peccata mundi.* That all the Churches of the World, which make one Catholick Church, should prepare Bread and Wine for the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of the immaculate Lamb, who took away the Sins of the World. And all this most agreeable to more ancient notions and Authorities, as that of St. || Irenaeus, Ἡ μὲν καθολικὴ Ἐκκλησία. The Church of God dispersed over the Universal World unto the Ends of the Earth. To which, add the words in the Paraphrastical Epistle of St. Ignatius to the Philadelphians, *Μία ἡ καθολικὴ Ἐκκλησία, &c.* The one Church, which the Apostles founded by their Sweat and Labour from one end of the

† Histor. Eccl. lib. 5. cap. 22.

|| Adversus Hæreses, lib. I. cap. II.

Earth
* Op
sit in
Chur
Worl
n. 55
vine
The
stifie
I hop
and
that
the C
Apol
Faith
first
conf
thro
St. V
All
and
diffe
the
sias
7a
To
eve
tha
Cat
mig
Ro

*Earth to the other in the Blood of Christ. [So * Opt. Milev. l. 2. p. 34. Ecclesiam Catholicam, quæ sit in toto terrarum orbe diffusa; The Catholick Church, which is diffused throughout the whole World. So † Collat. Carth. cum Donat. p. 37. n. 55. Ecclesia Catholica, quæ toto, sicut de illa divine testantur eloquia, terrarum orbe diffunditur; The Catholick Church, which as the Scriptures testify of it, is diffused throughout the whole World.]*

I hope the concurrent Authority of so many old and authentick Testimonies are sufficient proof, that it is neither *absolutely*, nor at all false, that the Church of Christ may be taken for all pure Apostolical Christianity, or for the Church of the Faithful dispersed over the Face of the Earth, at first called Catholick, or Universal, because it consisted of all particular Churches of Christ through the whole World, according to that of St. || Basil, εἰς λαὸς πάντες εἰς χεῖρὸν ἡλικιώτες, &c. *All those that believe in Christ are one People; and there is but one Church of Christ, though in different places. [So the Church of Smyrna in the inscription of their Epistle in Eusebius's Ecclesiast. History, lib. iv. cap. xv. Πάσους ἧς καὶ πάντα τόπον τῆς ἁγίας καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας παρρησίας. To all the Diocesses of the holy Catholick Church in every place. Where let me by the way observe, that if the holy Catholick Church, and the Roman Catholick Church, had signified the same, they might as well have said, To all Diocesses of the Roman Catholick Church in every place. In like*

* See l. 3. p. 61, 64. l. 4. p. 89.

† See Collat. Carthag. iii. p. 67. n. 7. p. 70. n. 51. p. 72. n. 72. p. 73. n. 82. p. 74. n. 89.

|| Epist. cccxciii.

manner, * *Saint Augustin, Ecclesia Catholica per totum orbem valide lateque diffusa*; The Catholick Church (not the Roman Catholick Church) is mightily diffused far and wide, throughout the World. So in his Epistle to Severinus, The Church is called Catholick, because it is diffused through the whole World.] So St. || Chrysostom, Αἱ καὶ πόλεις καὶ χώραι ἐκκλησίαι. Churches in Cities and Provinces, tho' many in number, make but one Church; for Christ is every where in them, perfect, and undivided. So Theophylact in 1 Cor. cap. i. Μία ἐκκλησία εἰσι πάντες οἱ πιστοί, &c. All the Faithful are but one Church, wheresoever they are. [So Apollinarius, Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. v. cap. xvi. calls the Church of Christ, ἡ καθόλου καὶ πᾶσι καὶ ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ ἐκκλησία. The Universal, and whole Church under Heaven. It would be strange, Sir, if the Church of Christ might not be taken for the Universal Church under Heaven, when they are thus reciprocally affirmed of one another, and signifie the same thing. Thus we may say in our Language, the Church of Christ is the Universal Church, or the whole Catholick Church under Heaven, and the Universal Church, or the whole Catholick Church under Heaven is the Church of Christ. For the Church of Christ is his mystical Body, of which he, and no other, is the Head, and Archetypal High Priest, and the Universal Church of the Faithful, commonly called the Catholick Church, is that mystical Body; and therefore

* De vera religione, Cap. 6. & 25. See his Epist. 152. Contra Donatistas, p. 448. Epist. Emerito, 164. p. 480. Epist. Festo, 167. p. 490. lib. de Genesi c. i. contra Faustum Manich. lib. 23. l. 9. & contra Adversar. legis, & prophet. lib. 2. cap. ult.

|| Hom. cxlix. Tom. v.

the Church of Christ may be taken for the Universal, or if you please, for his Universal Church. Of which St. *Augustin de Catech. Rud. cap. iii.* speaks in these words, *Ecclesia est populus Dei per omnes gentes, quod est corpus ejus*; The People of God in all Nations is the Church, which is his Body.] This one whole Universal or Catholick Church of the Faithful, unanimously confessing the true Faith, and thereby being visibly distinguished in all places, from the *Ecclesia malignantium & Conventicula Hereticorum*, as * St. Cyril speaks, it came to be called the visible Church; When thou comest into any City, saith that Father, do not barely enquire where is the House of God, nor barely ask where is the Church; but where the Catholick Church is: For this is the proper Name of this holy Mother of us all, the Spouse of our Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God. This visible Difference, and Distinction of the Catholick Church professing the true Faith, and rightly administering the holy Sacraments in all Cities and Countries from the Churches and Congregations of Hereticks and Schismatics, made the former, I say, be called *the visible Church*, because visible to all diligent Enquirers every where after the Catholick Church. And therefore that Definition of the visible Church in the 19th Article of the 39, which you bring to prove, that the Church of Christ cannot signifie all Christianity, proves the contrary, because it is a Definition of the Catholick Church, which is [in its several Parts] *a visible Church of Christ, or one (general Society or) Congregation made up of faithful Men in all places, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments du-*

* Catech. xviii. *ibid.*

ly administred according to Christ's Ordinance in all those things, that of necessity are requisite to the same; and by this preaching the Word purely, and administering the Sacraments duly, the Catholick Church (the *Cætus Fidelium*) is still visible in all places by its own Light, and visibly distinguished every where, à *Cætu malignantium*, as in *England*, and more particularly in *London*, our Church by its Catholick Purity in Doctrine, Worship and Government, is visibly to be distinguished from yours.

III. I NEED say no more in defence of my Distinction, but on I must go, because otherwise it will be said, I could not answer what I omit. You say then, *It is but too apparent that this Distinction* (in the 19th Article) *cannot possibly be apply'd to innumerable Sects, who neither preach the pure Word of God, nor duly minister the Sacraments: Therefore it is false, that the Church of Christ can be taken to signifie all Christianity.* It is most true, Sir, that this Definition cannot possibly be applied to any Sects, and by consequence not to your Church, [which with all its Splendour, and Greatness is but a Sect,] because the Word of God is not purely taught and preached, nor the Sacraments duly administred in it, that is, because it is not a Catholick Church. And I acknowledge it is false, that the Church of Christ in that proper Orthodox Sense can be taken for all Christianity in your meaning, but it is taken in as large a sense in mine, as Christianity signifies the whole Catholick, or Universal Church of the Faithful: In which sense it is used by St. Ignatius in his Epistle to the *Magnesians*, 'Ο γὰρ χριστιανισμὸς ἐκ εἰς ἰσθμῶν, *Christianity* [i. e. the Christian Church] *came not over to the Jewish Church, but the Jewish Church*

Church to Christianity: [And this is a proper and natural signification of the word, seeing as *Alexander Alensis* saith, *Par. iv. Quæst. xi. Ecclesia tota est in Christianis; The whole Church is made up of Christians.*] I cannot deny but Christianity is also taken for the Christian Doctrine; but it also signifies *Christendom*, or the Catholick Church, in which that Doctrine is professed. It is used so by *Matth. Paris, An. 1245. Congregati sunt Lugduni ex totius fere Christianitatis Latitudine Prelati.* It is used so in our Language; and to determin it to that Signification, I said, *The Church of Christ may be taken in as large a sense, as Christianity, for the Universal Church, wheresoever dispersed over the World.* And what Church the Fathers meant by the Universal Church, is evident from the Citations above, even the Universal Church of the Faithful; of which the Church of Rome, while faithful, was only a part; and you know well enough, that I who followed them in my Distinction, used it in the same sense. Then you go on: *Suppose it might be taken in that large sense, (for Sects who neither preach the Word of God purely, nor duly administer the Sacraments,) yet he had no reason to suspect, but that I took it for the true Church only, to which the Promises of perpetual Duration were given, and the one Holy Catholick, Apostolick Church, which soever it be, not including such pitiful Sects, as rise and fall in every Age. Therefore it is evident, he shut his Eyes here again, for fear of seeing the true sense of the Word.* That Christianity, or the Universal Church, may be taken in the most general, and improper sense of the Word, comprehending all Churches, as well heterodox as orthodox, sound as corrupt; those that do preach the Word of God purely, and ad-

H minister

minister the Sacraments duly, as well as those that do not, I have shewed above, and shall shew it again below, tho' you will not thank me for it, and I have also shewed, that I did not take it in that sense. But that I had no reason to suspect, that you took it for the *true Church* only, the *one holy Catholick Apostolick Church*, or as you afterwards say you meant, *the holy Catholick Church*, which my Creed put me in mind of, is most contrary to Reason, because I have told you, I had all the reason imaginable to believe you took it for the Roman Church; which most absurdly usurps the Title of the One holy Catholick Church, mentioned in the Creed, and most falsely pretends to be the only true Church, tho' it is neither the true Church, or a true Church of Christ, as true signifies sound and pure, nor the one holy Catholick Church, mentioned in the Creed, or a part of it, or a holy Catholick Church, but only a part of the Church Universal in the most large and improper sense of the Word, which you gave me occasion to mention above. It is you therefore, Sir, who shut your Eyes against the true sense of the Word, and not I, who used it in the ancient, common, true sense; for all the Churches of the Faithful, which make up one holy Catholick Church, of which the Church of *Rome* was once a principal part, but [for some very corrupt Ages] hath not been such a part. It is you, I say, who shut your Eyes against the true authentick sense of the Word, taking *the Church of Christ*, as I have observed before, for your own particular Church exclusively of all others, as is plain from your own words, by which you explain in what sense you understood the true Church of Christ, *viz.* That Church to which *the Promises of perpetual Duration were given,*

given, that is, in the arrogant sense of Popish Writers, your own Church. So in your XVIth Paragraph, *It follows, say you, that the Roman Catholick Church is the true Church: For some Church must be the true Church of Christ, and it can be none, to whom the Promises of Indefectibility, or perpetual Duration, have not been made good: But these Promises have not been made good to any, but the Roman Catholick Church.* Your Argument I shall consider in its proper place, but now only observe, that this absurd acceptation of the Church of Christ in its large general sense, only for the Church of Rome, is contrary to the Testimonies above-cited, and in particular, contrary to that Article of the Creed, *I believe in the holy Catholick Church*, as it is expounded by St. Cyril, and all others that expounded, or paraphrased the Creed for 900 Years. So St. † Augustin, the great Doctor of the Latin Church, in his Exposition of the Creed: *Sancta Ecclesia nos sumus, &c. We are the Holy Church; but I do not so speak, as if I meant we who are here, who now heard me speak, but as many as are faithful in this Church, i. e. in this City, as many as are in this Region, this Province, as many as are beyond the Sea, as many as are in the whole World, because the Name of the Lord is praised from the rising of the Sun, to the going down of the same; such is the Catholick Church our true Mother, the true Bride of the Bridegroom, let us know Her, because She is the Lady of so great a Lord.* So his CXX ‡ Epist. to Honoratus: *The one Catholick Church, &c. Which is mightily dispersed over the whole World, and*

† Feria ii. post Dominicam Palmarum. Serm. iii. Tom. x.

‡ Cap. xvi.

extended to the most distant Nations. [But had St. *Augustin* believed, that the Church of Rome in virtue of Christ's Promises to *Peter*, had been the one holy Catholick Church, of which in so many places of his Works he declares Christ to be the Head, instead of describing the Catholick Church in the foresaid manner, it would have been more natural, and easie for him to have said, the Roman Catholick Church, or the one Catholick Church, which is the Church of Rome. I might, lastly, make the same Observation of what he saith of that Article in the || Creed, *I believe the Catholick Church*: Saith he, *Credimus Sanctum Ecclesiam, utique Catholicam, nam & heretici, & schismatici congregationes suas Ecclesias vocant, &c.* but if the Roman Church, or Roman Catholick Church, be the same with the Catholick Church, it is matter of wonder to me, that neither he, nor *Ruffinus*, nor *Cyril of Hierusalem*, nor any other ancient Expofitor of the Creed, should omit to acquaint the Christian World with such a fundamental sense, or meaning of *I believe the Catholick*, or the holy Catholick Church. Nay, I wonder that the Nicene Fathers should not give that Explication of it in the Nicene Creed, if the Roman Church were indeed the Church of Christ in its general sense, or the Catholick Church mentioned in the Creed; for if it were, it certainly was the common Interest of Christians to have it so explained then, as you teach it now. But to return from this Digression, to shew that the Church of Rome is not the Church of Christ in its large and general Signification, let us go on to] St.* *Cyprian*, who saith, *à Christo una Ecclesia, &c.* From Christ, the one Church was divided over many Members. In like manner, there

|| De fide & Symbolo.

* Epist. 56. Ed. Oxon.

is one Episcopat diffused (through the Church) in an united number of many Bishops. So † *Tertullian*, Tot, & tanta Ecclesia, &c. So many and great Churches are that one, and first Church of the Apostles from which all are come; so all are First, and all Apostolical, while they all hold one Unity. This Church made up of the Union of all Churches, is that Church he calls the Spouse of Christ, out of which there is no Salvation; and he always speaks of the Church of Rome as a part ‡ of it. So || *Irenæus*, in the place cited in the Margent, &c. Pray, Sir, see the Notes of the most Learned *John Ernest Grabe*, upon the place in the Oxford Edition of *Irenæus*, where you see the Church of Rome is mentioned as a particular Church, in the same manner as other Members of the one holy Catholick Church. As other members of the Catholick Church, dispersed through the whole World, are mentioned in the third Chapter of his first Book, viz. those in Germany, Spain, Gaul; those in the East, in Egypt, Lybia, &c. all as parts of that one Body of Christ.

† De Præscript. cap. 20.

‡ Percurre Ecclesias Apostolicas — proxima est tibi Achaia? Habes Corinthum; si longe es à Macedonia habes Philippos, habes Thessalonicenses; si autem Italia adjaces habes Romam, unde quoque auctoritas præsto est, &c.

|| Sed quoniam valde longum est in hoc tali volumine omnium Ecclesiarum enumerare successiones, maxima, & antiquissima, & omnibus cognita à gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis Petro & Paulo Roma fundata, & constituta Ecclesia. — Ad hanc enim Ecclesiam propter potentiorē principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam.

IV. SO in the Sixth Canon of the First Council of Nice, It is clearer than the Sun, (saith * one of your own, and one of the Greek Writers,) that the Roman Church was taken by the Nicene Fathers, for a single Particular, and not for the Universal and Catholick Church, as now it is since absolute Monarchy was erected in the Church. Truly, in this Canon Roman and Catholick are as opposite, as universal and particular: So that the Roman Catholick Church is a Part and Member of the Universal Church, as the Churches of Alexandria, and Antioch are: From whence it is plain, that they have lost all Shame, who deny the Bishop of Rome to have a particular Diocess committed to his Government, as if the whole Christian World were but his private and particular Diocess; which are the Inventions of Flatterers and obnoxious Men, who would defend their Privileges and Immunities against the common Aristocratical Government (of the Church,) that they may make the Pope the supreme Ordinary, and most properly a Bishop. So in || another place; In the nine first Centuries, in which eight General Councils had met, it was never heard or read, that the Roman Church was taken in any other notion, or signification, than for a singular, or particular Church, and a Member of the Church Universal, as the other Patriarchal Churches were, who were also call'd Apostolick Sees, as well as that of Rome, which hath only Primacy above others. I refer you also to his Book, *De Ecclesiastica & Politica Potestate*, first published at Paris MDCLXXXVI, and afterwards, as was

* Edmundus Richerius *Hist. Conciliorum*, Edit. Colon. MDC LXXXIII. l. i. p. 65. And, Neilus Archiepiscopus Thessalonicensis de primatu Papæ.

|| Ibid. p. 754, 755.

pretended, at Colen, MDCXCI; and I should be glad to see it answer'd otherwise than by the Publick Censure, or perhaps by being put in the expurgatory Index, or prohibited Books.

To the Testimony of Richerius, a Writer of your own Church, let me add one of greater Antiquity and Authority, viz. That of Neilus, who was Archbishop of Thessalonica before the taking of C. P. by the Turks, in his Discourse, *De Causis Dissidii Ecclesiarum Lat. & Græcarum*, Πῶς τὸ το λάσεis, &c. Why do you say so? For if none of the Catholick Churches contradict, or but one, or but a few, I agree: But seeing there are five Catholick [Patriarchal] Churches, and but one contradicts the rest, is it not reasonable they should all consent to establish a Doctrine with infinite Suffrages, and so much Disquisition? — But say they, [the Latins] which are the four Churches? For we have no Difference but with that of C. P. for the other three [of Alexandria, Jerusalem and Antioch,] are but Names without reality, as being under the Power of the Barbarians, having no Wisdom, and but little Ability to find out the Truth. Furthermore, these Churches were under the Power of the Barbarians in the time of the Seventh [General] Council, and yet were not depriv'd of their Rights, but their Catholick Metropolitans fill'd their respective Chairs by their Legats, and Pope Adrian approved the things that were done. And whereas you say, there is no Wisdom in those Churches, I desire to know what Wisdom you mean, internal, spiritual Wisdom, or external, &c. And in the end of the Discourse; But when were these things so? Under what Emperor, or Bishop of Rome? Where are the Copies of those Letters [by which we were call'd to any Council] directed to the Emperor of the Romans, or our Church, or

To the other Catholick Bishops? Or, Where are the Letters sent from us to you, by which we declin'd coming to any Synod? Either let them be produced, or talk no more thus. And let so much suffice, that it is not lawful for the Church of Rome, by it self, to determine what belongs * in common to the [whole] Church; and how the doing so hath rent the Church of Christ, and is contrary to what the Laws and Constitutions of the Apostles and Fathers have ordain'd. So in his Discourse, *De Primatu Papa*, he saith, That it would be very hard to circumscribe the Church to Rome, because that would make it little different from the low and narrow State of the Jewish Church. And again, It is false and contrary to the Manners and Institutions of the Apostles, to say that the Pope judgeth all, and is judg'd of none. For St. Paul communicated the Gospel, lest by any means he should run, or had run in vain; and Peter suffer'd himself to be reprov'd by Paul. How then can the Pope of Rome, like a Tyrant, presume to be unaccountable, who boasts that he is Peter's Successor, which is evidently false. For in the case of Doctrine, Honorius is a Proof to the contrary, who by the Judgment of the Sixth General Council, was deliver'd up to an Anathema, Death it self not prevailing for his Absolution. And as for Matters of Life and Conversation, he as a Bishop, is subject to all the Laws that other Bishops are.

To this let me add the Testimony of the Great Nestarius, cited above. You say there is but one true Church, to which I agree, if you mean the Catholick Church, which according to our Doctrine is the Universal [Company or] Collection of all

* Τα πάντα τῆ ἐκκλησίας.

Churches :

Churches : But I deny it, if you speak of any particular Church, as you imagine the Roman to be the only true Church ; which would be true, if there were no other Churches in the World ; but I cannot admit it of any one particular Church, for there are many true particular Churches in the World ; and all are true, as far as they go by the Rule of right Doctrines, and follow the Faith of the Catholick Church, which is the Collection of all Churches. Wherefore you ought not to deny any one particular Church to be a true Church, tho' it were the least in the World. And I need not prove that the several particular Churches, when they are Orthodox, are true Churches, to any Man who is but tolerably versed in the Epistles of the Holy Apostles, the Canons of the Holy Councils, and the Writings of the Ancient Doctors. And that I may not produce many Authorities, let one suffice for all, I mean that of Celestinus Bishop of Rome, who, writing to Nestorius, saith, You know it was my Opinion, that unless you taught the same things of Christ our God, which the Church of Rome and Alexandria, and the whole Catholick Church holds, and as the Holy Church of the great Christian City [of Constantinople] taught, till the time that you were expell'd from the Communion of the whole Catholick Church. Here you see mention made of many particular Churches, and of the Roman among the rest ; and of one Catholick Church made up of the particular Churches, which is the Oecumenical Collection of them all, p. 6, 7. So p. 8. How can a Man be saved out of the one Catholick and Apostolical Church ? But That according to our Doctrine is the Universal Collection of all particular Churches in all places, but most especially of the four most Holy and Apostolical Patriarchal Churches

Churches of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, with those under the Bishop of Rome, when it happens he is not separate for any Innovations or particular Heresie. To the Testimony of these Oriental Bishops, let me add one out of many, from another of their own Writers, Dr. Launoy in his Epistle ad Raymundum Formentinum : The Holy Fathers in the first Nicene Council, which was General, did not call the Roman the Universal Mother Church. The Holy Fathers in the Council of Constantinople, which was General, did not call the Roman the Universal Mother Church. The Holy Fathers in the first Council of Ephesus, which was General, did not call the Roman the Universal Mother Church. The Holy Fathers in the Council of Chalcedon, which was General, did not call the Roman the Universal Mother Church. The Holy Fathers, in the second Constantinopolitan Council, which was General ; in the third Constantinopolitan Council, which was General ; in the second Nicene Council, which was also General, did not call the Roman the Universal Mother Church. The Holy Fathers in their Writings and Acts, Irenæus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Eusebius, Athanasius, Optatus, Hilarius, Basilus, Gregorius Nyssenus, Gregorius Nazianzenus, Siricius, Damasus, Ambrosius, Epiphanius, Chrysostomus, Hieronymus, Augustinus, Celestinus, Leo Maximus, Chrysologus, Fulgentius, Gregorius Magnus, did not call the Roman the Universal Mother Church.

But, Sir, besides the proofs already brought, it is evident from the Titles which the Bishops of Rome gave themselves, and which others gave them, that the Church of Rome was always look'd upon in ancient times as a particular Church.

In

In the
of L
low
City
self
of th
lonia
same
him
stile
Rom
So +
pero
stin
the
the
+ Pe
stile
in hi
as S
& a
shop
So
Atha
lius
is a
logy
any
spea
he c
supp

+ I
|| I
Anno
the vi
Edit.

In the Fragments of *Hilary*, there is this address of *Liberius*. To our most Beloved Brethren and Fellow Bishops in the East † *Liberius Bishop of the City of Rome*. And Pope *Zozimus* address'd himself in this manner to *Hesychius*, *Zozimus Bishop of the City of Rome*, to *Hesychius Bishop of Salonica* ‡. *Leo I.* in his Epistles often uses the same Title, and without *City* sometimes calls himself *Bishop of Rome* ||. *John I.* uses the same stile in these Words. *John Bishop of the City of Rome, sendeth greeting to Zachary Archbishop* *. So † *John II.* in his two first Epistles to the Emperor: *John Bishop of the City of Rome, to Justin the Emperor*. And so in his three Epistles to the Senators, *Johannes Romanus Episcopus, John the Roman Bishop to the most Illustrious*, &c. ‡ *Pelagius II.* in his ivth Epistle to *Auxanius* styles himself in the same manner. Nay, *Pius II.* in his Epistle *ad Martin Meyrum*, wrote like *Aeneas Sylvius* in this old stile. *Commendandi sunt & alii Romanae Urbis Praefules*. And other Bishops of the City of Rome are to be praised, &c. So *Julius* and *Liberius* are both stiled by || *St. Athanasius* in common with other Bishops. *Julius* and *Liberius* Bishops of Rome. The former is also stiled by him *Bishop of Rome* in his Apology, p. 754 & 767, and other places, tho' if any other Bishop or Patriarch ever had reason to speak more magnificently of the Bishops of Rome, he certainly had, whose Person and Cause was supported by them in the Arian Persecutions.

† In the v Century.

‡ In the v Century, Anno 416.

|| In the v Century, Anno 440.

* In the vi Century,

Anno 523.

† In the vi Century, Anno 532.

‡ In

the vi Century, Anno 579,

|| *Contra Arian. Orat. I. vol. I,**Edit. Paris. MDCXXVII, p. 291.*

Gregory Nazianzen in Orat. LII. calls Pope Damasus barely Bishop of Rome. St. Hierom in his Chronicon saith that Damasus was ordained the xxxv Bishop of the Roman Church, and so he styles him in many other places. So Pope Julius is stiled Ἰούλιος ὁ Ῥωμαίων ἐπίσκοπος : Julius Bishop of Rome : Sozom. Hist. Eccl. l. i. c. 17. in the same manner as Macarius is called Bishop of Jerusalem, Eustathius Bishop of Antioch, and Alexander Bishop of Alexandria. And in Socrat. Hist. Eccl. l. 4. c. 12. Pope Liberius is not only called Bishop of Rome, and Bishop of the Romans by the Historian, but Eustathius and other Bishops sent a Letter with this Inscription, κυρίῳ ἀδελφῷ καὶ συλλειτουργῷ Διέπρῳ, to our Lord and Brother, and Fellow-Minister Liberius. So St. Cyprian frequently calls the Bishops of Rome his Brethren, Co-Bishops and Collegues, as in Ep. 9. upon the News of Pope Julius's Death, De excessu Boni Viri Collega mei Rumor apud nos incertus est: The Report among us of the Death of that Good Man our Collegue is uncertain. So Ep. 55. ad personam Cornelii Collega nostri: Unto the person of Cornelius our Collegue. And the Inscription of Ep. 72. is Cyprianus & ceteri Stephano Fratri: Cyprian and the other Bishops to (Pope) Stephen our Brother. He writes often in the same stile to Cornelius. And in Concil. Carthag. T. 229. Neque enim quisquam nostrum Episcopum se Episcoporum constituit, aut Tyrannico Terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem Collegas suos adigit, quando habeat omnis Episcopus, pro licentiâ libertatis & potestatis suæ arbitrium proprium, tamque judicari ab alio non posset, quam nec ipse potest judicare, sed expectemus universi judicium Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui unus & solus habet potestatem, & præponendi nos in Ecclesia suæ Gubernatione,

& de
transl
then
that
from
file a
never
assum
script
above
ludem
ther.
Felici
Pape
ster,
dear
nes.
was t
mens
cil of
the R
man
You
and t
Writ
num,
the P
Cath
there
but r
purpo
It is
not E
callec
above
Bisho
to me

Et de actu nostro judicandi. Sir, I pray you to
 translate this faithfully to your Profelytes, and
 then do not tell them, as *Pamelius* falsely saith,
 that *St. Cyprian* learned this way of speaking
 from *Tertullian* the Montanist. For in his *Epi-*
stle ad Quintum, he saith of *St. Peter*, that he
 never claim'd any thing by force, or arrogantly
 assum'd the style of Primacy to himself. The In-
 scription of *Ep. 57.* is *Cyprianus, Liberalis*, and
 above thirty Bishops more, *Cornelio Fratri Sa-*
lutem, send Greeting to *Cornelius* our Bro-
 ther. And in the *Gesta Purgationis Cacilii &*
Felicitis, *Marianus Acacius* writes, *Dilectissimo*
Papa Sylvestro: To the most beloved Pope Sylve-
 ster, p. 98. So p. 99. *Frater charissime*: Most
 dear Brother. And *a te qui majores Dioceses te-*
nes. *Eusebius* in his *Chronicon* saith, that *Peter*
 was the first Bishop, *Linus* the second, and *Cle-*
mens the third of the Roman Church. The Coun-
 cil of *Sardis* sometimes calls the Pope, sometimes
 the *Roman Bishop*, sometimes Bishop of the Ro-
 man Church, and sometimes our Fellow-Bishop.
 You may see many more Authorities of this kind,
 and to this purpose, in the fore-cited learned
 Writer, in his *Epistle ad Ramundum Formenti-*
num, where he confutes *Bellarmino*, and proves
 the Pope to be but one particular Bishop of the
 Catholick Church, because when a Pope dyes
 there is only a Vacancy of the Church of *Rome*,
 but not of the Catholick Church. To the same
 purpose speaketh *Neilus* in the Tract last cited:
It is an evident Contradiction to say, the Pope is
not Bishop of a particular place, but that he is
called absolutely Bishop. For first I have shew'd
 above, that he is of the same Order with other
 Bishops; and that as often as there is occasion
 to mention him in the General Councils, which
 often

often happens, they call him Bishop of Rome : And how can the Bishop of Rome be otherwise than a Bishop of a certain place, unless they will deny Rome to be circumscribed by place ?

Sir, I think my self very unfortunate to have to do with an Adversary, who puts me upon proving that a part is not the whole, nor a particular a General, nor a Member the whole Body of Christ : But I have been forc'd to make proof of this, which one would wonder should not appear to be self-evident to any common Understanding, and such a plain Contradiction it is, that the * learned Writer cited in the Margent asserts, if the Church of Rome were in your sense the Holy Catholick Church, or the One Holy Catholick Church, then the Catholick Church dispers'd every where would but be one Diocess, and by consequence there would be but one Bishop of it, because the rest of the Bishops would all be nominal Bishops, or Vicars of the Pope. He also observes, that from the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, being the One Holy Catholick Church, it must follow that the Pope is the Universal or Oecumenical Bishop. A Title, saith he, which the Apostolick See condemned twelve times by the Pen of Gregory I. † I refer you to him in the Margent, and beseech you if you can to give him a fair, and solid Answer.

I will conclude all with that Barlaam the Greek Monk saith on this subject :

But because you (Latins) profess to believe in the Roman Church and Roman Faith, and force others so to believe, it concerns us to discourse of

* Johannes Lauinoius in Epist. V. ad Francs. Bonum.

† Hic gradum sisto, &c. Ibid. See also his Epist. ad N. Galinaum.

this matter. Our Holy Fathers speak in a different manner of the Roman Church and the Catholick Church. For when they speak of the Catholick Church, they understand the Congregation of all Christians throughout the World, who keep the Doctrines of Religion entire and unchanged. But when they speak of the Roman Church, they speak of it as the Council of Carthage did in the CIV Canon, to distinguish it from other particular Churches in the World, in this manner. It is resolved that Letters be written to the most Holy Pope Innocent, about the difference that is arisen between the Church of Rome and Alexandria, that both Churches may keep the Peace between themselves which Christ hath commanded. For no Man instead of saying the Catholick Church, ever said the Roman Church. In like manner when they speak of the Catholick Faith, they understand that Faith which all Orthodox Christians in all places profess. And no Man, who is not mad, ever call'd the Christian Faith the Roman Faith. For we are commanded not to believe in the Roman Faith and Church, but in the common Catholick Faith and Church, which Faith and Profession we have kept, and will keep by God's help unto the end. Did any Confessor before a Tyrant, or Penitent Heretick in the Confession of his Faith, ever say, I believe in the Roman Faith and Church? Whoever required such a Confession of any, that is destructive of our Religion? Wherefore it neither becomes us to say, we believe in the Roman Church, nor you to say that you believe in the Catholick Church. For it is necessary for us to continue to observe the Laws of the Catholick Church, and to retain its Traditions entire and pure, to profess we believe in it, whose Doctrines we observe. But you who have rejected the Traditions

of.

of the Catholick Church, of which you make no account, and have introduced other strange Doctrines instead of them, with what decency can you profess to believe in that Church which you have rejected? Therefore it was fit for you to set up the Roman Church in Opposition to the Catholick Church, for so you evidently shew that you have fallen from the Communion of the Catholick Church. Indeed with shame and remorse of Conscience you pretend to keep the Constitutions of the Church of God, and of the Holy Apostles, and of our Holy Fathers; but then if any one asks you how it comes to pass that you transgress this or that Constitution? You fly to the power of the Pope as your Refuge; like the Tyrants, who, when they could not persuade the Martyrs by words, were not ashamed to make them Examples of their Power.

C H A P. VI.

I. HAVING made good the first member of my distinction, in which I said the Church of Christ may be taken in as large a sense as Christianity, or the Universal Church, and shew'd that Roman Church was never taken for the whole Catholick Church; I must now proceed to consider what you say against the second member of it, in which I said that the Church of Christ may also be taken for some part of the Universal Church; at which in one of your Figures of Oratory, you make an Exclamation like a Man astonish'd in these words: *But yet, says he, the Church of Christ may be taken for one or more particular Churches, but not the Universal Church.*

Chu
the
in
Sir,
to p
Chr
Uni
ved
the t
mili
and
cite
Con
proc
ly fo
Syno
of t
the
nus.
Lyes
Holy
at R
his
giving
he, s
was
to be
unde
Com
expr
clesia
the C
Catho
+ E
ciav.
+ E
Sancti

Church. Behold, Sir, the disingenuous trifling of the Gentleman, who is resolv'd to take the word in all other senses but the right one. Behold, Sir, your own assurance, by which you go about to persuade your Disciples that the Church of Christ cannot be used to signifie a part of his Universal Church. I think I have sufficiently proved above, that *the Church, the Church of God, the Church of Christ, the Catholick Church* are familiarly used in this special sense [both absolutely and in apposition, or if you please, both implicitly and explicitly, of which, to abate your Confidence, suffer me to give you some more proofs. They are taken absolutely, and implicitly for the Church of Rome in † Pope Cornelius's Synodical Epistle, which he sent to the Bishops of the other Churches, to notifie the return of the Confessors to him from his Rival Novatianus. They, saith he, discerning his Fraud, and Lyes, and Perjury, came back from him into the Holy Church, meaning the Church of the Faithful at Rome, in Communion with himself. So in his ‡ Epistle to St. Cyprian Bishop of Carthage, giving an account of the same matter. We (saith he, speaking of them) acknowledge Cornelius who was elected by Almighty God and Christ our Lord, to be the Bishop of the most Holy Catholick Church, understanding the Catholick Church of his Communion at Rome. This is plain from other expressions of Cornelius in that Epistle, as *ad Ecclesiam unde exierant, venerunt, They came to the Church from whence they went; that is, to the Catholick Communion, or Church of Cornelius at*

† Eusebius's Hist. Eccl. lib. vi. c. xliii. εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν ἐκκλησίαν.

‡ Ep. 49. Edit. Oxon. nos, inquiunt, Corneliū Episcopum Sanctissimæ Catholica Ecclesiæ, &c.

Rome. So speaking of *Urbanus* and *Sidonius* the Confessors, *They came*, saith he, *to our Paesbyters*, to tell them, that *Maximus* the Confessor and Presbyter desired to return with them † into the Church, that is, into the Church at Rome, which was in himself, and not in *Novatianus* his schismatical Rival, and *Anti-Pope*. As for their other phrase in that Epistle, *Non ignoramus unum Episcopum in Catholica Ecclesia esse debere*, it is to be translated thus in an indefinite sense, *We are not ignorant that there should be but one Bishop in a Catholick Church*, and not in the *Catholick Church*. This I prove from *Eusebius's* words in the fore-cited Synodical Epistle, which are not ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, in the *Catholick Church*, but ἐν καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, in a *Catholick Church*. But to proceed; *St. Cyprian*, in the beginning of his ‡ Epistle to *Antonianus*, twice uses the words *the Catholick Church*, in this special sense, meaning the particular Church of *Rome* under *Cornelius*, as distinguished from the schismatical Church of that place, under the Usurper *Novatianus*; and I have cited the passage in the * Margent for the proof of what I say against the false Gloss of *Valesius*, in his Notes on *Euseb. Eccl. Hist. Lib. vi. C. xliii.* In the same special sense he uses the words *Catholick Church* for the Church of *Rome* under *Cornelius*, as distinguished from

† In Ecclesiam.

‡ Ep. 55.

* Accepi primas Literas tuas, Frater charissime, Concordiam Collegii Sacerdotalis firmiter obtinentes, & Catholicæ Ecclesiæ coherentes, quibus significasti cum Novatiano te non communicare, sed sequi concilium nostrum, & cum Cornelio Coepiscopo nostro unum tenere consensum. Scripsisti etiam ut exemplum earundem Literarum ad Cornelium Collegam nostrum transmitterem, ut sciret te secum, hoc est, cum Catholica Ecclesia communicare.

that
of C
val
will
ples
Chur
used
will
had
claim
may
most
Chri
Chur
Cath
the v
Chri
the V
genu
mean
to fi
dising
use i
the l
ticula
uses t
both
in his
lius's
Nequ
ter, a
faith
ry of
Heret

* In
lick Chu

that under *Novatianus*, and for his own Church of *Carthage*, as distinguished from that of his Rival *Fortunatus* in his lix. Ep. to *Cornelius*, as you will see below ; and if you desire more Examples of this kind, to shew that *the Church, the Church of Christ, the Catholick Church*, may be used specially to denote particular Churches, I will give you more when you please.] But, Sir, had I been in an Error, did it become you to exclaim against me, for saying the Church of Christ may be taken for a particular Church ; you who most abusively apply *the Church, the Church of Christ, the true Church of Christ, the Catholick Church, the Holy Catholick Church, the one Holy Catholick Church*, in the most general sense of the words, as they signifie the whole Body of Christ made up of all the faithful Churches in the World, to the Roman Church ? If it be *disingenuous trifling in me*, to say, *the Church of Christ*, meaning in its strict particular sense, may be used to signifie particular Churches, how much more disingenuous, trifling and absurd is it in you to use it in the general signification (as you * do in the last words of your Query) for your own particular Church ? St. *Cyprian*, Bishop of *Carthage*, uses the words *Catholick Church* in the former sense both for his own Church, and for that of *Rome* in his Epistle to Pope *Cornelius*, which in *Pamelius's* Edition is the 55th, in the *Oxford* the 59th, *Neque enim ad Catholicæ Ecclesiæ majestatem pariter, ac dignitatem pertinere debet, &c.* Neither, saith he, doth it concern the Grandeur and Dignity of the *Catholick Church*, what the Impudence of Hereticks and Schismaticks enterprize among

* In these words, Before your Separation from the Holy Catholick Church, or from the Roman Catholick Church.

themselves ; in which place he is so trifling , as to take the *Catholick Church* in a particular sense for the *Roman Church* ; and in the next Period, he uses the words *absolutely* in the same sense again, for the *African Churches*, which in him were united into one particular *Metropolitcal Church*, *Quando miserim tibi proxime nomina Episcoporum——qui integri & sani in Ecclesia Catholica fratribus presunt* : Seeing I sent you the Names of the Bishops, who being intire and sound, are set over the Brethren in the *Catholick Church*. An Expression, saith your Learned *Sorbon Doctor* * *Launoy*, in which, when it is used in the Titles or Subscriptions of Popes, who anciently stil'd themselves *Bishops of the Catholick Church*, these words always ought to be understood, *Urbis Romæ*, of the *City of Rome*. So Pope *Felix* in his fourth Epistle to *Zeno* the Emperor, speaking of *Peter* the *Eutychian Bishop of Alexandria*, saith, *That he who receiv'd a false Priesthood from Hereticks, (Catholica non poterat Ecclesia præsidere,) could not preside over the Catholick Church*, i. e. the *Catholick Church of Alexandria*, so call'd, because it was a Member of the *Catholick Church*.

II. THEN you go on : Suppose I should say, the *Kingdom of England* is a rich and glorious Nation, see how he would raise Difficulties upon those clear words. What means he by the *Kingdom of England* ? Does he mean *Somersetshire alone*, or *Somersetshire, Wiltshire, and Berkshire* ? or *England, Denmark and Norway* ? Just so, when I said the *Church of Christ* cannot perish, he answers, What means he by the *Church of Christ* ? Sir, if this Argument which you bring as a Simile,

* In Ep. IV. ad Franciscum Bonum.

proves

proves any thing against me, it proves ten times more against you ; who taking the Church of *Rome* for the whole Church of Christ, and the whole Church of Christ for the Church of *Rome*, are as absurd, as a *Somersetshire* Man would be, who took the whole Nation for the County of *Somerset*, or the County of *Somerset* for the whole Nation, because perhaps he had heard King *Alfred* sometime kept his Court there. But in truth, your Similitude is not just, and by consequence proves nothing, because there is great difference betwixt a Kingdom or a Nation, and the Provinces or Countries of it ; and the whole Church of Christ, commonly call'd the Catholick Church, which is dispers'd over the Earth, and the particular Churches Metropolitcal, Patriarchal, Diocefan, or Parochial, which are Parts thereof. A Kingdom or Nation is a *heterogeneous* Body, or *Whole*, whose Parts are not of the same Nature with it, and with one another, but of a different Denomination and Nature from it, and from one another : And therefore if you should say, that the Kingdom of *England* was a rich and glorious Nation, it would be most absurd to ask you, if you meant *Somersetshire*, or any other County, because *Somersetshire* hath not the Name or Nature of a Kingdom, as the Kingdom of *England*, of which it is a part, hath. But *the Church*, or *Church of Christ*, or *the Catholick Church*, is an *homogeneous* Body, which hath Parts of the same Nature with the whole, and with one another ; and therefore every part of it is aptly call'd by the name of the Whole, as in other *homogeneous* Bodies. For Example, Every Grain, or Wedge of Gold is Gold, and every Drop of Milk is, and is therefore call'd Milk : And in the Sea, every part of it, as the *Ægean*, the *Euxine*, the *Baltick*, are abso-

lutely call'd the Sea. Thus the Sea of *Tiberias* is absolutely call'd the Sea in the New Testament: And the *Red Sea* in the Old Testament, is perhaps above one hundred times absolutely call'd the Sea, as I have proved, every particular Church may be absolutely call'd the Church, or the *Catholick Church*, or *the Church of Christ*, always meaning the Church, or Catholick Church of that place, whose Name is understood. Thus to put an end to this part of the Controversie, I may properly say of any faithful Bishop, that he is a Bishop of *the Church*, or of *the Church of Christ*, or of *the Catholick Church*, always understanding that part of the whole Church, or that particular place of which he is Bishop; as the Penitent Presbyters † in *St. Cyprian*, who returning from the *Novatians*, acknowledged *Cornelius* to be a Bishop of the most holy Catholick Church, not in your most absurd general, but in the particular sense of the words, understanding the *Catholick Church of Rome*, of which he was the first and rightful Bishop, in opposition to *Novatianus* his Rival, whose Church was no part of the holy Catholick Church, as being the Schismatical, and not the Catholick Church of *Rome*. [As for the other part of your Reply in these words, viz. If I should say, *The Kingdom of England was a rich Nation*; he would say, *What mean you by the Kingdom of England*? England, Denmark, and Norway? It is trifling, and sophistical in the highest degree, and as such unworthy of a Casuist, and as a Casuist, and Divine, you ought to be ashamed of it. Because the Adjunct *England* determines the general signification of Kingdom to a particular Realm, as *France* in this Expression,

† *Epist. XLIX. Edit. Oxon. Pamellii XLVI.*

the Church of France, or the Church of Christ in France determines the general sense of *the Church, or the Church of Christ to a particular Church*. This you could not but know, though you made no Conscience by such a sophistical Comparison, to make your Profelyte believe, that my asking you what you meant by *the Church of Christ*, which hath no Adjunct to determin, or particularize its general Signification, was as absurd, as if you should say, *The Kingdom of England was a rich Nation*; I should then ask you, *What you meant by the Kingdom of England?* England, Denmark, and Norway? That is, if by one particular Kingdom particularly named, you meant three. Indeed, if by the Kingdom of *England*, I had asked you, if you meant *England, Denmark, and Norway*, I should have been as absurd, and impertinent, as you would make me; even as impertinent, and absurd, as if I had asked you, speaking of *the Church of France*, if you meant the Church of *France*, and any two, or three Churches more; but, I think, it was no such impertinence, or impropriety to ask you, what you meant by the indefinite, or undetermined Expression in your Supposition, *the Church of Christ*.] But if it were, you can shew it, and then I will submit. Then you add, *as if the most extravagant Heresies were a part of the Church*; no indeed, Sir, not of the Church of Christ, in my proper signification of the words, for the Universal Church of the Faithful; much less can extravagant Heresies, of which Popery, *as Popery*, is one, be the whole Catholick Church: Or, *as if one or two particular Churches* [say you] *were the Church of Christ, and not rather a part of it*. This, Sir, is crudely expressed, because one or two Churches may happen to be the whole Church of Christ, when

I 4

there

there are no more, as first *Hierusalem*, and then *Hierusalem* and *Antioch* were, before there was a Church of *Rome*; which I put you in mind of; first, to shew that the Church of Christ was extant before the Church of *Rome*, and by consequence, that your Church cannot be the one holy Catholick Church; and, secondly, to shew you that the Church of *Rome* may perish as other Churches have done, and yet Christ may have a Catholick Church on Earth, after she is no more a Church, as well as before she was one. Secondly, as that is a crude, so it is a fallacious expression; for I never asserted, as you falsely suggest, that one or two particular Churches were, or could be the Church of Christ; but that these words, *the Church of Christ*, might be used to signifie a part of Christ's Church, comprehending one, or more Churches; but when they are so used and applied, they do not signifie that the particular Church, or Churches, for which they are implicitly used, is the whole Church of Christ. No, Sir, 'tis you and such *Curial* Writers of your Church, as you, that not only abuse those words in their general sense, to signifie your own particular Church, but abuse them, with a design to make the Unlearned and Unskilful believe, that it is *the whole Church of Christ, the one holy Catholick Church*; of which, were it as pure, and sound, as in St. Peter's time, it could be but a part, and in St. Clement's Epistle above-cited, it is spoken of as such. Lastly, To create a confidence in your Disciples, you conclude with triumphant Reflexions: *But these Gentlemen are grown so much Strangers to Christ's Church, that when it is nam'd, they lift up their Heads, and know not what it means. Therefore, if he had been so minded, he might easily have known, that by the* Church

Church
Yes,
holy
of t
tion
Faith
Chri
tion
and
and
learn
new
pres
narc
Con
Can
thes
its
Vice
of
are
ning
Me
Faith
der
cial
Sir,
is v
lick
Uni
pur
Chu
mor

†
Prim

Church of Christ I meant the holy Catholick Church.
 Yes, Sir, I knew very well that you meant the holy Catholick Church in your own abusive sense of the words, but not in the true Primitive Notion of it, for the Society, or Company of all the Faithful dispers'd through the World, over which Christ is the Head; but in the false modern Notion of *Cardinal Peron*, of which more hereafter, and according to the new Definitions of *Canisius* and *Cardin. Bellarmin*, which *Dr. † Launoy*, who learnedly defends the old Definition against their new ones, truly saith, is accommodated to the present state of the Church, (meaning your Monarchy of the Church,) and not to the Nature, Constitution, and Interest of the Church of Christ. *Canisius* concludes his Definition of the Church in these words, *which is govern'd, and preserv'd in its Unity, under its one Head Christ, and his one Vicegerent the chief Pontif*, meaning the Bishop of Rome. *Bellarmin*, whose Popery it seems you are not yet ashamed of, speaks yet plainer, *defining the Church to be one true Congregation of Men united together in the Profession of the same Faith, and Communion of the same Sacraments, under the Government of lawful Pastors, but especially the one Vicar of Christ upon Earth.* This, Sir, is the Catholick Church you mean, which is very contrary to the Nature of the true Catholick Church, and the old Principle of Catholick Unity, as taught and practis'd in the former and purer Ages of the Church. || Then the Catholick Church was not understood to have any one common Head, but Christ; then every faithful Bishop

† In his *Ep. ad Nic. Gataineum*. || See a Book intiruled, *The Principles of the Cyprianick Age*, printed for *Walt. Kettleby*.

was thought to be his Vicar, and Vicegerent over his Flock, as much as the Bishop of Rome is over his, and every other Metropolitan independent of him at Rome. * Nay, after the creation of Patriarchats, the rest were all co-ordinate with him of Rome. As he had his *Urbicarian* Jurisdiction, so they had theirs; the Church of Rome then first one of the Four, afterwards one of the Five Patriarchats, as to Catholick Union and Communion, was no more than one of the rest. Indeed, Sir, *we cannot but lift up our Heads in Astonishment at the Flattery of your Curial Writers*, who by their new Notions and Definitions have quite perverted the ancient Doctrine of Church Government, and the *Aristocratical* Constitution of the Church. The Church of Christ's Foundation, and those Definitions, are inconsistent one with the other: And so far are we from being *Strangers* to the former, that our certain knowledge of its Constitution makes us still oppose the latter, as † *Richerius, Launoy, and Dupin*, and many other of your own best Writers have done, to their immortal Praise; who have baffled the Sovereignty of the Roman Pontif, and the new Curial Notion of Catholick Communion, and the Catholick Church. But, Sir, it had been enough in a modest Adversary, to reflect upon me alone, and not upon my Brethren, if I had been such a Stranger to what is meant by the *Church of Christ*. For the Clergy of the Church of *England* are not answerable for my Ignorance, or for my voluntary or involuntary Faults, had I committed any such. And whether you, or I best

* See Dr. *Cave's* ancient Government of Churches, and Dr. *Sam. Parker's* Hist. of the first six Centuries of the Church,

† See their Works cited in this Answer.

know what the Church of Christ means, which is called in our Creed the Holy Catholick Church, and not the Roman Catholick Church, let the World judge from what I have writen in this Answer to your Reply. I knew the meaning of it so well, and your meaning too, that I knew they were as opposite to one another, as Truth is to what is False; you always sophistically meaning, as I have shew'd, the Roman Church by *the Church of Christ*, or *the holy Catholick Church*, of which it was never more than a part; and the Creed meaning all the faithful Churches in the World, which make up the mystical Body of Christ; otherwise, as the Greek Writers have told you, it would be all one to say, I believe in *the Roman Catholick Church*, as to say, I believe in *the Holy Catholick Church*. You perceiv'd by my Distinction, that I discern'd your absconded false meaning of those words from the true one, and that oblig'd you to treat it, and me in such a scurrilous, and scornful manner. To which, perhaps you were the more encourag'd by being unknown, and because Boldness commonly passes for Argument in the opinion of unskilful and unexperienc'd Judgments, who cannot think, that an *approv'd* Guide in Controversies of Religion, who talks and writes with so much Assurance, can be in the wrong. When I had told you, that your one Query, *Where the Protestant Church was before Luther*, was as many, as there were Protestant Churches, and therefore desired to know, which of the Protestant Churches you meant; then I put you in mind, that this uncertain Phrase, *Protestant Church*, when it was determin'd, might be taken either for *the Clergy and People of the Protestant Church*, or *the Faith, Worship, and Polity of it*: And if you would tell me, that by the
Protestant

Protestant Church, you meant the Faith, Worship, and Polity of the Church of *England*, and not the Succession of Clergy, and People teaching and professing that Faith, &c. then I would tell you, where the Church of *England* was many hundred Years before *Luther*, even where the present Faith, Worship, and Polity of your Church never was, *viz.* in the *Primitive Church*. One would think this was a very obvious plain Distinction, and a fair Offer; but you are always angry at my Distinctions, because they detect your Fallacies. Therefore let us see how worthily you treat this part of my Answer in the Fifth Paragraph of your Reply: *He*, say you, *still finds more Difficulties in understanding this Phrase, as he calls it*, the Protestant Church. *As he calls it*: Pray, Sir, is the word *Phrase* of my invention? Or, am I the first user of it? Is it not a word of common usage in our Language, for a fashion, or way of speaking? And what other fitter name should I have given that loose Expression of yours? if you know one more proper, tell it me, and I shall use it: For, *ἡ ἐκκλησία αἱ μανθάνων*, as old as I am, I am willing to learn. [I go on in your words;] For, saith he, *it may either signifie the Clergy, and People of the Church, or the Faith, Worship and Polity of it. Why had we not this Difficulty started before, when we had the former Dispute about the word Church, that we might have done with it once for all?* I defie him to give a Reason, except that the Fancy bit now, and not then, or else perchance because he was resolved to have a new Cavil in reserve for this place. Yes, Sir, I still maintain, that in Answer to a Query, about the Age of any Protestant Church, and particularly our own, it is most proper to distinguish betwixt the Clergy and People, and

and the Faith, Worship, and Polity of the Church, because the Faith, Worship, and Polity of a Church formed, or reformed, may be much older, than the Church it self. But why do I say *may be*, for they *must be older*, than a *Reformed Church*, which is supposed to have been depraved some time and in some degree, from the pure Faith, or Worship, or Polity, or altogether, which it formerly professed. This Distinction you rightly call a Difficulty as to your self, because it brought a Difficulty upon you, which you could not answer. For according to this Distinction, which the Understanding will make, when Enquiry is made about the Age of Churches, I told you a fair and learned Adversary would have put the Question thus : *I desire to know where the Church of England, or where your Religion was many hundred Years before your pretended Reformation?* But you durst not put the Question so plainly, and honestly, as I observed in my Answer ; but expressed your self so in your Challenge, which is an Explication of your *Query*, as if you desired to know where the Clergy, and People of the Protestant Church, as *Protestant*, were before *Luther*. Name, say you, *your Bishops, Writers, Churches, nay, one single Congregation, or Village of Protestants, for 900, or 1000 Years before your Separation from the holy Catholick Church.* This made me tell you, that you might as well have ask'd me, where our Protestant Kings, and Courts were, before *Edward VI.* And this was the reason, the true and obvious reason, which you could not but discern, why I used that Distinction where I did, and why I used it not before ; because tho' there could be no Protestant Clergy, and People of the Church of *England*, before the Church protested against Popery, and reformed
from

from it, and so the Protestant Church of *England*, as to the Clergy and People of it, could be no older than the Reformation; yet as to the Faith, Worship, and Polity of it, it was as old as the Primitive Church. Then you proceed: *And when all is done, the Difficulty is none: For by the word Church, is properly meant a Congregation of faithful Men; so it is in divers others, even heretical Definitions; (I presume you mean the Definitions, which Hereticks give of the Church.)* All this, Sir, by your favour, is a meer impertinence, and nothing to the purpose; a meer Shift to elude the application, and force of my Distinction. For a *Church*, and a *Congregation of faithful Men*, differ no more, than the Definition, and the Thing defined, as a *Man* and a *rational Creature*; and what may be affirmed, or denied of the one, may be affirmed, or denied of the other; and what Distinction is applicable to the one, is as applicable to the other: As for Example, it is all one to say, A *Man*, or a *rational Creature*, may be considered, as to his *Body*, or as to his *Soul*. And so it is all one to say, a *Church*, or a *Congregation of faithful People*, may be considered with respect to the *Men*, or with respect to the *Faith, Worship and Polity*, which they profess and practise; and if these are different *Respects*, or *Formalities* of such a *Congregation*, then it may be distinguished into those *Respects*, and sometimes be understood, and taken in one respect, and sometimes in the other. In that [* old Orthodox] Definition of a *Church*, a *Congregation of faithful Men*, which is the *Predicament*, and the *Faith, Worship and Polity* which they hold, form different Conceptions, or Ideas,

* See Dr. Launoy's Epist. ad N. Gatinaum.

and therefore differ formally from one another ; and because they are different Conceptions and Ideas, the Understanding can, and will distinguish them, when it is necessary, or expedient to state, or answer any Question, as this captious one of yours, *where the Protestant Church of England was many hundred Years before Luther?* Then it follows : *I do not remember to have read any where, that Church is taken for the Faith, Worship, and Polity of the Church ; and if he have any where read it, yet he ought to reflect, that in reason he should have taken it in that sense, in which Divines of all sides take it commonly in this Dispute of the Church, viz. for a Congregation of faithful Men, and not for the Faith, Worship, and Polity which they profess.* Sir, I know not what Opinion your Disciples may have of your Memory and Reading, but it is neither your Memory and Reading, or mine, that must determin Disputes, or be the measure of Controversie between us ; nor is it the Question, whether you have read, much less whether you remember you have read, that the Church is taken for the Faith, Worship and Polity, that is, for *the whole Constitution* of the Church, but whether it may be so consider'd, and taken upon a clear and full Answer to such a fallacious Query, as yours. The use and acceptation of all words, whether in their literal, or figurative sense, had once a beginning ; and whether this sense of the Church, which is one of the two, in which it is taken, hath been used before, or no, is not material ; but whether upon this occasion, it is apposit and just. If you should see a Book with this Title : *Of the Difference between the Popish, and the Primitive Church of Rome, or, Of the Difference between the ancient, and modern Church of Rome,* would you think the Author treated of the difference of the Men,

Men, or of the Faith, and Worship, and Government of the two distinguished Churches? Or, when any of your Religion say, as they say often, they hope to see *the old Catholick Church of England* set up in England again, do you think they mean the Men of that old Catholick Church, who are dead and forgotten, or the Faith, Worship, and Polity thereof? Or, suppose I should ask you this Question, *If the present Church of Rome be a true Catholick Church, I desire to know where it was 1400, or 1500 hundred Years before the Council of Trent?* Would you think, Sir, I asked you in this Question, where the Men, or where the Doctrine, Worship, and Polity of your present Church were, so long before the Council of Trent? Lastly, Suppose a Monk of the unreformed Order of * *Citeaux* should go to *la Trappe*, and put this Query to the Fathers of the strict Reformed Order there, *If the Cistercian Order here be the true one, I desire to know where it was Two hundred Years before your pretended Reformation by the Abbot de Rancé, and the other Fathers of la Trappe? in 1662.* Sir, I suppose this Question ought to be understood by the common use of Speech, not of the Men, but of the Primitive Rules, and Institutions of the *Cistercian Order*: and if a Religious Order [which agrees with the Church in this, that it is a Society,] may be taken for its Rules, and Institutions prescribed by the Founder, or Reformer, as well as for the Men of it, then I hope it is no great impropriety to take the word Church for the Faith, Worship, and Polity of a Church, which both make, and make known the Constitution thereof. But in this and your second Paragraph, you yehe-

* *Dictionnaire Historique & Critique de Monsieur Bayle.*
mently

ment
using
nific
shoul
you
of w
fenses
holy C
you r
confo
Christ
for y
gin in
fenses
cation
are u
inten
for y
litera
Wor
taken
thing
sense
Flesh
no L
Etor
in a
comm
word
Disci
tium,

† S
Praise
the C
† T
rat. in

mently accuse, and almost deride me, for not using words in their most proper and obvious signification; which, Sir, you and your Writers should not do, because of all Men in the World, you most pervert the established significations of words, and abuse them in the most improper senses. Thus you do, when by *the Catholick, the holy Catholick, or the one holy Catholick Church*, you mean your own Church only; and when you confound the real, and the corporal Presence of Christ in the holy *Eucharist*, and when pleading for your † Idolatrous Prayers to the Blessed Virgin in words, which in their proper and received senses signifie Divine Worship, or as *direct Invocation for temporal and spiritual Blessings*, as any are used to God himself, you say you mean and intend no more than a desire that she should pray for you. Lastly, Tho' the *figurative*, and not the literal, is the true and proper sense, in which all Words and Sentences in Holy Scripture are to be taken, which command us to do any flagitious thing, yet you take those words in the literal sense, where our Saviour saith, *Unless ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, you have no Life in you*; which St. *Austin*, the greatest Doctor of the Latin Church, saith, are to be taken in a figurative sense, because in the literal they command a heinous Crime. I will put down the words, and leave you to translate them to your Disciples: ‡ *Si præceptiva locutio est aut flagitium, aut facinus vetans, aut utilitatem, aut bene-*

† See *Speculum Beata Virginis*, or a Discourse of the due Praise and Honour of the Virgin *Mary*, by a true Catholick of the Church of England. 1686.

‡ Tom. 2. De *Doctrina Christiana*, cap. 14. See also *Eucharist* in *Psalms* 98: Tom. 8.

ficentiam jubens, non est figurata, si autem flagitium, aut facinus videtur jubere, aut utilitatem, aut beneficentiam vetare, figurata est. Nisi Manducaveritis inquit, carnem filii hominis, & sanguinem biberitis, non habetis vitam in vobis: facinus, vel flagitium videtur jubere. Figurata est ergo precipiens passioni Domini esse Communicandum, & suaviter, atque utiliter recondendum in memoria, quod pro nobis Caro ejus Crucifixa, & vulnerata sit. Farthermore, This absurd unnatural sense, in which your Church takes the words in their literal signification, implies many Blasphemies against the Dignity of our Lord's Body and Blood, as that his Body may be carried away with a puff of Wind, or by any Vermin that may eat it, that it may be vomited up by the Priest, that it may grow mouldy, that his Body and Blood may be poisoned, that his Blood may be turned into Vinegar, or congealed into Ice, or make the Receiver vomit by Emetick Mixtures, and the like. All this your Church supposes in her Missal *de defectibus in celebratione Missarum occurrentibus*; and you have obliged me to put you in remembrance of them, and make this Digression, about using words in their properest sense.

IV. BUT to return: You say, you do not remember to have read any where, that Church is taken for the || Faith, Worship, and Polity of the Church. But if you do not remember to have read it so taken any where, I do in a Writer cited in the Margin, whom perhaps you do

|| Nestarius Patriarcha Hierosol. p. 216. *Ad illud autem Chrysostomi dicentis, Hom. 4. in Isai 6. Facilius Sol exstinguetur, quam ut Ecclesia obscuratur, intelligitur de Catholica Ecclesia, aut per Synecdochen de fide; pro causa causarum.*

not

not
hav
take
for
you
bad
say,
no:
angr
know
whic
like
thes
but
But
were
the
i. e.
it is
the
that
form
ter,
time
prop
ly fa
stam
and
Aeth
think
the
Sir,
than
You
of a
one.

not know, and in another whom you know, and have a good Opinion of, I mean your self, who take the Protestant Church for *the Religion*, i. e. for the Faith, Worship, and Polity thereof, in your fourth Paragraph: *What reason, say you, had I to make a question of it, whether he would say, the Protestant Church was the true one, or no: — and I do not conceive why he should be so angry with me for not taking him to be such a knave as to be of a Religion, [i. e. of a Church,] which he would not say was the true one.* The like you do in your ninth Paragraph, where after these words, *Who teach their Church, is nothing but ours reformed*, you add in the next Period, *But I hope to prove to you, that if their Religion were true, &c.* In both these places, you take the Protestant Church of *England* for its Religion, i. e. for its Faith, Worship and Polity, wherein it is reformed from yours; and indeed, such is the Alliance betwixt a Church and its Religion, that it is almost impossible to discourse of the former, without sometimes taking it for the latter, or to discourse of the latter, without sometimes taking it for the former, and the one is as proper a Metonymy as the other. We commonly say, the Church of the *Jews* is in the Old Testament, and the Christian Church is in the New; and should I tell you, I was going to the *Abyssine Ethiopia* to see the Church there, you would not think I went to see the Men, but to see and learn the Religion of that Church. Before I go on, Sir, perhaps you may expect I should give you thanks for your course Complement, in saying, *You do not take me to be such a knave, as to be of a Religion which I would not say was the true one.* Indeed, Sir, I heartily thank you for it, and.

and frankly confess, I should be a great knave to profess the Religion of the Church of *England*, and not believe it to be true. I believe it to be as true, as I believe yours to be false: To use *Tertullian's* Phrase, I believe it to be the Religion that the Church had from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, and Christ from God. I believe the Church of *England* to be an Apostolical Church, *ob Consanguinitatem Doctrinae*; and in the sincerity of this Belief, I could by God's assistance suffer Martyrdom for it, and in the Apostles passive sense of Resistance, resist Popery unto Blood: For nothing less than such a sincere Persuasion of the Truth and Worth of our Religion could oblige me in a croud of other business, to undertake the defence of it against such a sophistical Adversary as you, who employs me [to the great loss of my time,] almost in nothing, but in solving Fallacies, and untwisting little Snares.

V. THE conclusion of your sixth Paragraph is admirable, and I should injure you if I did omit it: *Thus you may guess, Sir, (say you,) that it is a harder thing to bring this Gentleman to the Bar, and make him speak out plainly guilty, or not guilty, than perchance it would be to convict him, after he had once made his Plea.* Sir, this is a noble Metaphor, and it looks great in you to arraign me, and make me hold up my Hand at your Bar. But to leave you to reflect upon the incongruity of Pleading to an Indictment, and giving an Answer to a Query, pray what would you have me to have answer'd, or pleaded to? *You desired to know, if the Protestant Church was the true one, where it was many hundred Years before Luther?* I shew'd you the ambiguity, and multiplicity

tiplicity of this Query, and according to the * Rules of Logick and Controversie, cited in the Margin, in order to make a plain Answer, I desired to know, first, which of the many Protestant Churches you meant, that I might tell you, if it was the true one? And, secondly, I desired to know, whether you meant the Clergy, and People of that Protestant Church, or the Faith, Worship, and Polity of it? and told you as plainly as I could speak, that if you meant the latter, I would tell you, *where the Faith, Worship, and Polity of the Church of England was many hundred Years before Luther, even where the present Faith, Worship, and Polity of the Roman Church never was, i. e. in the Primitive Church.* One would think this was a plain Answer, or in your Metaphor, *a direct Pleg.* But it was your Art to make your Disciples believe it was no Answer. Nay, that I was as unwilling to make an Answer to your Query, as a Thief to plead to an Indictment at the Bar; but tho' they, I believe, are, yet *we are not ignorant of your Devices.* If they were not hindered by Ignorance, or Prejudice, they might have perceived, that my *No-Answer* was of such force, as to make you declare you *meant the Protestant Church of England*, and that by Protestants, you meant *Christians* professing our Religion many hundred Years before *Luther*, or the Reformation; and yet they did not discern my Answer to be an Answer, though I named who, and where those Christians were that professed our Religion, even *the Primitive Christians, in the best and*

* Such as these: *Æquivoca ante factam distinctionem, nec definiiri possunt, nec sub scientiam cadere. Ambiguum omne prius est distinguendum, quàm definiendum, aut alio quovis modo tractandum. Indistinctio parit continuas lites, nec aliter, quàm distinguendo constabit, quid, aut de quò agitur.*

purest Ages of the Church. If you had spoken as plain in your Query, as I have forced you to speak in your Reply, you had had this close Answer proved as plainly and largely, as I hope I have proved it above. This you know very well, and therefore you would not put your Query in plain terms of certain sense and signification, according to the fore-mentioned Canons of Controversie: Wherefore it was you, Sir, who would not, who durst not speak out plainly, lest you should have a clear, close and full Answer, which you were afraid of, and had no mind to receive, and you and her Brother daily pushing on your Profelyte, made her believe, that my Answer to your ambiguous Query, in which I desired you to explain your Terms and Meaning in order to a full Reply, was mere tervigerfation, and proceeded from unwillingness to *plead guilty*, by owning my self baffled, and so the *Day was your own*; and that, as you suggested, being all I could say, it was then high time for her *to be reconciled*.

C H A P. VII.

I. **Y**OU write with the same Arrogance, and Contempt of me in your IX Paragraph: *Thus forsooth, was it necessary to dispute like Grammarians* (you should have said Logicians) *concerning the meaning of clear words.* But did not I shew you they were words and expressions of uncertain signification? And did not the known Canons of Controversie, which I have cited above, require that in the Dispute between us, we should come to a certainty of the sense of all your

your ambiguous terms and expressions, and that till the sense of them was adjusted, it was impossible for me to give an answer to your Query. Then it follows: *But because it is so difficult a thing to draw him to a direct Answer, I will endeavour to gather one from his words, which are conformable to those of the other Doctors of his Church, who teach that their Church is nothing but ours reformed: which this Gentleman explains by the comparisons of a dirty Face washed, a muddy River cleansed, and a sick Man heal'd.* Sir, the direct Answer which you give for me is very true, and I admit it, tho' in process of Controversie I was not come to it. You say you gather it from my words, and so you might have gathered many more direct Answers from them, if you had pleased, as that no *Congregation of Christians professed your Religion in the primitive Church.* And as for my Similitudes, from which you gather it, they were used by me to shew how absurd and unreasonable, as well as sophistical your Challenge was, in these words: *Name your Bishops, Writers, Churches; nay, one single Congregation, or Village of Protestants for 900 or 1000 Years, before your Separation from the Holy Catholick Church.* After I had put you in mind, how you begged the grand question between us, I told you, you might as well have bid me name our Protestant Kings and Courts before *Edward VI.* or have asked a Sloven where his clean Face was for so many Days, before it was washed? Or a sick Man, where his healthful Constitution was all the while he laid sick? Or a Man who with great Cost and Labour had cleansed a River, which for many Ages had been muddy, where the pure and clean Stream of it was, all the time it ran so foul? I used these

easie familiar comparisons and illustrations for
 the sake of your Convert, to let her see [if she
 would have seen] the fallacy of your Challenge,
 and to that end told you, that if it had been
 fairly penned, it should have been put in these,
 or the like words: *Name any Bishops, Writers,
 Churches, nay, one single Congregation, or Vil-
 lage of Christians, that professed your Religion for
 900 or 1000 Years before your Separation from
 the Church of Rome;* adding, that if you would
 put it so, I would give you an Answer, and then
 desire you to name one Church, Bishop, or Wri-
 ter, nay, one single Congregation, or Village of
 Christians, that 900 or 1000 Years ago professed
 the Tridentin Faith. This detection of your fal-
 lacy forced you to say, you meant Christians pro-
 fessing our Religion, and had you said so at first,
 you had had the direct Answer, I have given you
 in this Paper; and I pray you to take notice a-
 gain, that I challenge you to *name any Bishops,
 Writers, Churches; nay, one single Congregation,
 or Village of Christians, that professed your Reli-
 gion for a Thousand Years and upwards before the
 Council of Trent.* I have answered your Chal-
 lenge plainly, and I expect you should answer
 mine; your own honour, and the honour of your
 Religion, the honour of the Council of Trent,
 the honour of Pope Pius IV's Creed; in a word,
 your present Church requires you should answer
 it, if you can, and if you do not, I shall take it for
 granted, you are conscious to your self that you
 cannot answer it. But to go on with the direct
 Answer, which you say, you have gathered out of
 my words, I hope, say you, *to prove to you that
 if their Religion were true, our Religion would
 have been none at all, and consequently incapable
 of being reformed, from which I will draw other*
con-

consec
 ly as
 to you
 by you
 mation
 abando
 not. or
 [with
 nounce
 becom
 all.
 tween
 and W
 stianit
 Apost
 Mahu
 to be
 stacy,
 newe
 groun
 and
 it ou
 ciplin
 by v
 profess
 catho
 be re
 of th
 this
 and
 shall
 fear
 tend
 my
 Soci
 in m
 ous

consequences of great importance, and this as briefly as may be, not to be tedious. Before one comes to your important consequences, one would think by your words, that your Church before the Reformation had solemnly deny'd Jesus Christ, wilfully abandoned the whole ancient Apostolick Faith, and not only corrupted the pure Christian Religion [with adulterous additions] but maliciously renounced it, and apostatized from it, and so was become not a corrupt Church, but no Church at all. Pray, Sir, tell me, is there no difference between a Christian, that is corrupt in his Faith and Worship, and a spiteful Apostate from Christianity, that renounces Jesus Christ? Such an Apostate from Christianity to Judaism, Paganism, Mahumetanism, or Atheism, ceases in my Opinion to be a Christian, by such a wilful malicious Apostacy, and is thereby made incapable of being renewed again, as many learned Men think, who ground their Opinion on *Hebr. ch. vi. 4, 5, 6. and x. 26, 27, 28, 29.* Or if he may be renewed, it ought to be by extraordinary Methods of Discipline or Renovation, very different from those by which Lapsers in time of Persecution, or in prospect thereof fell away. Or by which an uncatholick, erroneous and corrupt Christian is to be restor'd upon Repentance to the Communion of the Catholick Church. Sir, I have premised this Parallel, or Comparifon betwixt a Church, and a single Christian, because I think it just, and shall have occasion to make use of it, though I fear you will be as angry at it, when you see the tendency of it, as you were at my Distinctions in my first Answer. And a *Religious Order*, being a Society, as the Church is, I must also put you in mind of the likeness betwixt a corrupt Religious Order, and a corrupt Church. I did it partly

ly above, in the Comparison betwixt an Unreformed Monk of *Cîteaux*, and a Father of the Reformed Order at *la Trappe*. I am a little fond of this Comparison, because a Gentleman of my acquaintance, who went to see the Reformed Abbey there, was asked by one of the Fathers this Question, in terms to this effect: *Sir, I perceive you are an English Gentleman, and if the Church of England be a true Church, I desire you to tell me where it was before Luther?* Father, replied the ingenious Gentleman, suffer me to ask you a Question, before I answer yours: You are a Monk of *la Trappe*, and if the Order here at *la Trappe* be the true Cistercian Order, I desire you to tell me where it was, before the late Reformation of Abbot de Rancé? The Father perceiving his Question about the Church of England, was answered by the Gentleman's Question of the same Nature, about the Reformed Order of *la Trappe*, let fall the Discourse about Religion, and proceeded to talk of other things. But to return to my Comparison of a corrupt Church with a corrupt Religious Order, let us suppose that a Father of the corrupt Cistercian Order, much depraved from its first Reform, or Institution, in the Year 1094, should say to a Father of *la Trappe*, *You, and your Fathers here, teach, that your Order is nothing but ours reformed; but I hope to prove, that if your Order were true when you reformed, ours would have been none at all, and consequently incapable of being reformed.* I cannot but think, Sir, that if you were Moderator in such a Dispute, you would have interposed here, and asked the unreformed Monk, if he thought the Cistercians, and particularly those of *la Trappe*, had renounced their Vow, and reneged their Order, and turned Seculars, before the pretended

tend
ed h
bre
cor
two
and
cula
and
flect
and
no c
Her
or n
Chu
cal,
Apo
ligi
stian
ty a
go a
and
in o
Il
(fa
to a
Idol
ing
latr
ren
betw
true
foun
Wo
nify
ver
Sir,
be

tended Reformation in 1662. You would have asked him, I fancy, if there was no difference between breaking, and renouncing their solemn Vows, or corrupting, and revolting from their Order, or between not living according to their first Rules, and utterly abandoning of them, and turning Seculars? or, between a dissolute Monk, or Order, and no Monk, and Order at all? Pray, Sir, reflect a while on the parallel Cases of a Church and Religious Order, and then tell me if there is no difference between a corrupt Christian, (be he Heretick, Schismatick, or both,) and a *renegade*, or no Christian; or between a corrupt Christian Church, be it Heretical, Idolatrous, or Schismatical, or all together, and no Church, or a Church Apostate from all Christianity; or between a Religion, that holds the irresistable Truths of Christianity with pernicious Errors, and no Christianity at all. Stop a little here to reflect, and then go along with me to take a review of your *Proofs and Consequences* OF GREAT IMPORTANCE, in order as they lye.

II. I BEGIN with your Proofs. First then, (say you in your Tenth Paragraph,) *It is essential to a true Church of Christ not to teach and practise Idolatry. But the Roman Catholick Church according to their Principles, teaches, and practises Idolatry.* Sir, you have been often told the difference between metaphysical, and moral Truth, or between a Church metaphysically and morally true; a Church *morally true*, signifying a right, sound, orthodox Church, pure in Doctrine and Worship; but a Church *metaphysically true*, signifying no more than a Church, which is true in verity of Essence, or a *real Church*. You see, Sir, I am distinguishing again, and I doubt you'll be still angry at my Distinctions; but for all that I must

I must not only distinguish, but apply my Distinction, and tell you that it is essential to a morally true Church of Christ, *i. e.* to a sound, right, orthodox Church, pure in Doctrine and Worship, not to teach and practise Idolatry, even as essential or necessary, as it is to be a sound Man, not to have the Leprosie, or Plague: But to a Church only true in a metaphysical sense, *i. e.* to a *real* Church, it is not essential or necessary not to teach and practise Idolatry, no more than it is to a real Man, not to have the Leprosie, or Plague. This difference between a barely real, and a right, sound, and pure Church, is the ground of another Distinction, which Writers use, when they tell us, that the word Church is taken properly and strictly, or improperly and loosely; *properly and strictly taken*, it signifies the truly Catholick Church, ἐκκλησία ἐκλεκτή, &c. the elect Church, the holy Congregation, the Synagogue of Saints, as St. Ignatius calls it, otherwise the *Cetus fidelium, seu Catholicorum*, the Church of truly Catholick, and faithful Believers only: But *improperly and loosely taken*, it is used to signify the Christian Church of Believers, in common, orthodox or heterodox, sound or corrupt, as they are distinguished from Infidels, that do not believe in Christ, as from *Jews* and *Greeks* of old, and now from *Mahumetans*, according to that of † *Critopulus*, ἐκκλησία ὅσιν ὡς μὴ τινες βέλον, &c. The Church, as some speak, is the Congregation of all those, who believe the Preaching (or Doctrine) of the Gospel in any manner, I mean the Orthodox Believers and Hereticks. [So *Nestarius*, as cited in my Answer to your Query, *Quum autem Ecclesia, sumitur spiritua-*

† In Confess. fid. cap. 7.

liter, &c. When the word Church is taken in a spiritual sense, it signifies a lawful, or unlawful Church; such as those are, who are called in the *Canons* irregular Churches and Schisms; of which the *Psalmist*, *Odio habui Cætus malignantium.*] And according to this Acceptation of the word Church, in common, for orthodox, or heterodox Churches, I believe you will not easily deny, but that an heretical, schismatical, or idolatrous Church, notwithstanding its Heresie, Schism, or Idolatry, may in verity of Essence, be a real, tho' not a right, sound and pure Church. I say *may be*, because some Heresies, and Idolatries may be of such a nature, as to amount to Apostacy, or renegation of God, or Christ, as some do not. But how culpable the Churches of God have been by Heresies, or Schisms and Idolatries of the latter sort, and yet own'd by him for his Churches, is evident from the Scriptures of both Testaments. In the Old Testament, we read that the Church of God was corrupt to that degree by Idolatry, as well as other Sins, that he threatned to treat them without Mercy, as if they were not his People. The Prophet *Hosea* signified the former to them by the Prophetical Symbol of taking a Wife of Whoredoms, by which they were to understand their own idolatrous Whoredoms, and the latter by the Names of her Daughter and Son, *Lo Ruhamah*, and *Lo Ammi*. Not to recite their other Sins, as want of Truth, Mercy, and Knowledge of God, Lying, Perjury, Bloodshed, Adultery and Schism, but to insist upon their Idolatry, as set forth by that Prophet; the Church of *Israel* was not the Spouse of God, *i. e.* his faithful Spouse, nor he her Husband, *i. e.* no longer her loving Husband, because she committed spiritual

tual Whoredom, and play'd † the Harlot, in asking counsel of Stocks, and sacrificing upon Mountains, and burning Incense under Oaks and Elms. The Spirit of Whoredoms was so in the midst of them, that they knew not the Lord. All Israel was defiled. His Wrath was kindled against them for the Calf of *Samaria*, and therefore he did not accept of their Sacrifices. They made them goodly Images, the Calves of *Beth-aven*, but he threatened to spoil them; and yet notwithstanding their Backsliding, and Rebellions, all this while they were his People, his *Peculium*, his Church, which he sent his Prophets to *hew*, that is, to reform them, when they had sinned more and more, and made molten Images of Silver, and Idols, according to their Understanding, of which they said, *Let the Men that sacrifice, kiss the Calves; and yet*, saith he, *I am the Lord thy God from the Land of Egypt, and thou shalt know no God but me, for there is no Saviour beside me.* And as their God, he spoke to them by Prophets, and multiplied Visions upon Visions, and used Similitudes after Similitudes, *as that of the Wife of Whoredoms and her Children*, by the Ministry of his Prophets, that they might repent, and that he might heal them, and not send them into Captivity. And all the while they were in Captivity in the state and condition of *Lo-Ammi*, without Prince, or Prophet, or Temple, or Altar, or Sacrifice, or Incense, or Priestly Ministration, yet they pray'd unto him as his People, and he heard their Prayers, and took care of them as his *Peculium*; and upon their Repentance, brought them out of Captivity,

† Hosea ii. 5. iv. 15.

almost

almost
their
rious
the
an H
high
you
trous
Chap
Sixte
any
or to
rusa
and
the
the
few
nege
then
God
with
turn
few
was
ture
and
ner
Who
ny I
Nay
God
God
God
ship
ten,
the

almost in as miraculous a manner, as he brought their Fathers out of *Ægypt*, and made them a glorious Church again. The like might be said of the Church of *Judah*; The faithful City became an Harlot: *Judah* play'd the Harlot upon every high Hill, and under every green Tree; [and if you would have more, I refer you for the Idolatrous State of that Church to the Twenty third Chapter of the 2d of *Kings*, from the First to the Sixteenth Verse:] Wherefore, if not to practise any Idolatry be essential to the Being of a Church, or to a real Church, then both the Church of *Jerusalem*, and *Israel* divers times lost their Being, and God, as to human sight, had no Church amongst the *Jews*. Some Idolatries indeed may destroy the Being of a Church, as if the Church of the *Jews* had wilfully, and maliciously denied, or reneged the God of their Fathers, who brought them out of the Land of *Ægypt*, for another false God, and absolutely renounced their Covenant with him, and apostatiz'd from the Law, and turn'd *Gentiles*, as much as if they had never been *Jews*. But their Idolatry, tho' very abominable, was not of that heinous Church-destroying Nature, because in their Idolatry, they still owned, and worshipped God, tho' in an idolatrous manner: *Thou hast polluted the Land with thy Whoredoms, thou hast play'd the Harlot with many Lovers, but return again to me, saith the Lord.* Nay, when they worshipped *Baal*, they worshipped God also. Their Crime was not wholly leaving God for *Baal*, but worshipping *Baal*, as well as God. And the like they did, when they worshipped *Moloch*, as well as the Lord, as it is written, *Ye have offer'd me Sacrifices and Offerings in the Wilderness forty Years, O House of Israel, but*
you

you have born the Tabernacle of your † Moloch and Chiun, your Images the Star of your God, which you made for your selves; therefore I will cause you to go into Captivity, saith the Lord, whose Name is the God of Hosts. So Solomon went not fully after the Lord, as did his Father David, but built an High Place for Chemosh, the Abomination of Moab, the Abomination of the Children of Ammon; but tho' he went after other Gods, yet did he not renounce the God of Israel, but his Heart was said to be turned from the Lord, because he broke the First Commandment, in having other Gods besides him: Had he been faithful to the Lord, had he loved him with all his Heart, and Soul, and Strength, he had not gone after other Gods. And so for the People and Church of Israel, even in the Reign of Ahab, it was not their fault, as I said before, that they apostatized from the Lord to Baal, revolting utterly to the false from the true God; but that they worshiped Baal sometimes, as well as him, which was called forsaking of God, halting between two Opinions, and following God and Baal by turns, because they went not fully after him, nor loved him the true and jealous God with all their Heart, and Soul, and Strength, but served him and Baal too. But notwithstanding all this time, because they did not utterly and maliciously forsake him, they remained his real, tho' not his faithful Church; and as they never forsook, or renounced, or disowned him wholly, so he never wholly forsook, or renounced, or disowned

† Acts vii. 43. *Ye took up the Tabernacle of Moloch, and the Star of your God Remphan, Figures which ye made to worship them; and I will carry you away beyond Babylon.*

them,

them
forge
Baal
unto
did u
Messi
Gholl
turned
Churc
make
Blessin
you p
in Pos
consec
thens
oxumi
Christ
nay, [
fer, to
it is
Strine
plies
again
can in
calls i
so ind
hath
and su
Soul,
that h
If, la
vine
they u

† v
manis

them, for his Great Name's sake. They often forgot the Lord their God, as when they served *Baalim*, and *Astaroth*; but yet when they cried unto the Lord, he delivered them. This he still did upon their Repentance, till they crucified the Messiah, and resisted the Miracles of the Holy Ghost, and the Preaching of the Apostles, who turned from them unto the Gentiles. So in your Church, you worship the only true God, but you make Invocations to departed Saints for the same Blessings, and in the same words of Invocation that you pray for unto him; and you pray unto them in Postures of Worship before their Images, and consecrated Statues set over Altars, as the Heathens did before the Images of their *Di Medioximi*, or Mediatory Deities. You also worship Christ before the Image of his Human Nature; nay, [as you believe the Host, or consecrated Wafer, to be Christ,] so you worship it as him, tho' it is impossible it should be him; and the Doctrine upon which you ground that Worship, implies as many Contradictions, and Indignities against his Honour, as any other the Wit of Man can invent. [One of your † Popes blasphemously calls it, *The Creator of Heaven, and Earth*; and so indeed it must be, if, as the Council of Trent hath defined, the holy *Eucharist* is truly, really, and substantially the Body, and Blood, with the Soul, and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that he is all, and whole under one Kind only. If, saith that Pope, *there is any thing plainly Divine among Men, for which the Saints above, if they were subject to Envy, would envy us below, it*

† Urban VIII. before the *Missal*. *Si quid est in rebus humanis planè divinum, &c.*

certainly is the most holy Sacrifice of the Mass; by the benefit of which, it comes to pass, that Men by a kind of anticipation ‡ enjoy Heaven in Earth, whilst they do not only see with their Eyes, but handle with their Hands the Creator of Heaven, and Earth.]

III. You also worship the material Cross, as I have already proved; and nothing can excuse you, much less justify you from Idolatrous Worship in these Instances, but such like Apologies as the Philosophers framed, to justify the Pagan Idolatries, and what hath usually been said in defence of your Idolatrous Worship, will go a great way to justify theirs. All this, Sir, is as true as your Conclusion is false, that if you are guilty of Idolatry in these Instances, as we not only affirm, but prove, that *therefore the Roman Catholick Church, is no true, (i.e. no real) Church of Christ, nor was it when we left it.* I have already shewed the difference between a true Church in a metaphysical and in a moral sense, and told you before, that when I came to this part of your Reply, I would use *real*, where you use *true* Church, to discover the Fallacy of your Argument, and how you imposed upon your Convert, by the ambiguity of that Expression. And pray, Sir, let me ask of the single, or personal Members of your Church, or any part of it, upon *supposition*, that you are guilty of that Idolatry we charge you with; do they therefore cease to be Christians, as well as sound and orthodox Christians? Are they no more Christians, than if they had maliciously renounced Christianity? Are they become profess'd Infidels of any sort, *Jews*, or *Turks*, or *Pagans*, or *Atheists*, or *Deists*, by being Mem-

bers
try;
ans,
Pract
the w
single
no C
real C
Chur
forfar
they
as rea
latry,
woul
as me
tio Ca
as we
say, I
Canon
nine C
before
it is e
Christ
which
and I
were
by the
becom
ans.
crifice
their C
Priests
were t
to Lay
Rank
forbid
shews

bers of a Christian Church corrupted with Idolatry; and if they are *true*, that is, *real* Christians, notwithstanding their Idolatrous Belief and Practices, [as most certainly they are,] how comes the whole Church, which is made up of those single Members, to lose her Being, and become no Church, by the same Idolatry? As they are real Christians guilty of Idolatry, so is she a real Church guilty of Idolatry; and, as if they would forsake Idolatry, and other Errors of your Church, they would thereby commence sound, true, as well as real Christians; so would she reform from Idolatry, and her other Errors and Corruptions, she would thereby become a Church morally, as well as metaphysically true, *i. e.* [*Cætus*, or *Congregatio Catholicorum*,] a holy, pure, sound, orthodox, as well as a real Church. [To confirm what I say, I entreat you to consult *Canon. Apost. lxxii. Canon. Concil. Nicen. xi, xii, xiii, xiv.* and the first nine Canons of the Council of *Ancyra*, which was before the Council of *Nice*. From these Canons it is evident, that Christians, who denied God, and Christ, and sacrificed to Idols, and ate of the Meats which were offered to them in the *Decian, Licinian,* and *Dioclesian* Persecutions, and by consequence were declared Idolaters, yet were not thought by their Fall to have fallen from Christianity, or become Gentiles, or cease thereby to be Christians. Nay, the Clergy-men, who denied, and sacrificed, were not thought thereby to fall from their *Clergy*, or Orders, or cease to be Bishops, Priests, or Deacons, though in some cases they were thought worthy to be degraded, or reduced to Lay-Communion, and in others, keeping their Rank and Dignity, they were only silenced, and forbidden to execute their Functions; which shews in the judgment of those early and pure

L 2

Ages,

Ages, that the sin of Idolatry did neither destroy the Being of a Christian, as such, nor deface the Character, or null the Orders of a Priest. If that had been the effect of it, they could not have been reconciled, or restored to the Church according to those Canons, and the Practice of the *African Church* in the *Decian Persecution*, as may be seen in the Synodical Epistle of the *African Bishops* to *Cornelius*, which is the LVII in the *Oxford Edition* of *St. Cyprian*, and in that Father's Tract *De Lapsis*, where you will find, that Lapsers into Idolatry were reconciled by degrees of Penitence, proportioned to the degrees of their Crimes. The same was the Practice of the Church of *Rome* under *Cornelius*, as appears from *Eusebius's Eccl. History*, lib. vi. cap. xliii. particularly from the Story of *Trophimus*, a Bishop, whom, though he had offered Incense to Idols, in the Persecution, that Pope admitted to Lay-Communion. I must also entreat you to consult *St. Hierome's Dialogue* against the *Luciferians*; where he proves the † *Arian* Priests and Bishops to have been true, that is, real, and valid Priests, and Bishops, and the *Arian Churches* to have been true, i. e. real Christian Churches, against *Lucifer* of *Calaris*, and his Followers, ‡ who looked upon them as no Christians, but as Gentiles; and their Bishops,

not

† *Ita etiam tempore Arianae hæreseos, quicumque cum Arianis communicaverant, aut in Arianum dogma lapsi fuerant, non solum suscepti sunt in Communionem, sed etiam Episcopatus retinuerunt. Ac contraria Luciferi Calaritani, severitas improbata est. Du Pin de Antiquæ Ecclesiæ Disciplina. Dissert. iii. cap. ii.*

‡ *Orthodox. dixit, Omnes ergo hæretici Christiani non sunt. Lucif. Jam superius audisti. Orthod. Si Christiani non sunt, Diaboli sunt. Lucif. Nemo dubitat. Orthod. Si autem Diaboli sunt, nihil refert hæretici, an Gentiles. Lucif. Non refello. Orthod.*

not a
Chur
as Sy
Capi
That
ing i
I wil
you,
Argu
tell r
Perg
ing,
held
ans,
taug
ficed
Anti
cause

Ortho
dum si
ut liber
Quod i
stianos
Cy ber
tem Ar
esse cur
Ecclesi
non ta
hoc Ar
nuncup
foueam
Si Ari
castra
cipis.
* A
mena E
henditu
simulac
hoc ad
pene ni

not as Bishops, but as Heathen Priests; and their Churches, not as Christian Churches, but rather as Synagogues of Antichrist, and Satan, like the Capitol, which ought not to be called Churches. That Dialogue, and St. *Hierôme's* way of arguing in it, is wholly contrary to yours; and tho' I will not charge the Heresie of *Lucifer* upon you, yet I affirm it is the consequence of your Arguments; and I pray you to consider of it, and tell me, if you think,] the * corrupt Church of *Pergamus* ceased to be a Church, or lost her Being, by having those among them, who not only held [and taught] the Doctrine of the *Nicolaitans*, but the idolatrous Doctrine of *Balaam*, who taught the Children of *Israel* to eat things sacrificed to Idols, and commit Fornication, and put *Antipas*, Christ's faithful Martyr, to Death, because he bore his Testimony against them. Did

Orthod. Igitur praefixum inter nos habemus de haeretico sic loquendum sicut de Gentili. Lucif. Plane fixum. Orthod. Quare nunc, ut libet, quoniam inter nos constat haereticos Gentiles esse. Lucif. Quod interrogatio mea cogere volebat, expressum est haereticos Christianos non esse. Nunc restat conclusio. Si Ariani haeretici sunt, & haeretici omnes Gentiles sunt, & Ariani Gentiles sunt. Si autem Ariani Gentiles sunt, tum constat nullam societatem Ecclesiae esse cum Arianis, id est, cum Gentilibus: manifestum est vestrum Ecclesiam, quae ab Arianis, id est, a Gentilibus Episcopos suscipit, non tam Episcopos recipere, quam de Capitolio Sacerdotes, ac per hoc Anti-Christi magis Synagoga, quam Christi Ecclesia debet nuncupari. Orthod. Ecce impleta est prophetia: paravit mihi foveam, & ipse incidit in eam. Lucif. Quonam modo. Orthod. Si Ariani, ut dicis Gentiles sunt, & Arianorum conventicula castra sunt Diaboli, quomodo in castris Diaboli Baptismum recipis.

* Angelo Ephefi deserta charitas imputatur. In Angelo pergamena Ecclesia Idolothytorum esus, & Nicolaitorum doctrina reprehenditur. Item apud Angelum Thiatyrorum Hiesabel Prophetissa, simulacrorum asca, & fornicationes increpantur. Et tamen omnes hoc ad penitentiam Dominus hortatur, sub comminatione futurae pena nisi convertantur. Hieronymus adversus Luciferianos.

the Church of *Thyatira* cease to be a real, as well as a pure Church, because she let the Woman *Jesabel* teach, and seduce her Servants to commit Fornication, and to eat things sacrificed to Idols; which provoked God to threaten to cast her into a Bed of Sorrow, and them who committed spiritual Adultery with her, into great Tribulation, unless they repented of their Deeds? So he threatned the Church of *Pergamus* to fight against her with the Sword of his Mouth, unless she repented. Repentance, if real, would have made them pure, and morally holy Churches; and so Repentance and Reformation would make yours. But if she will not remember from whence she is fallen, and repent, if she will not reform from her spiritual Fornications, and do her first Works, God will come upon her as a Thief, and she shall not know in what hour he will come upon her. He shall call her, when she doth not think of it, to account, and make her pay the long, long Reckoning of his infinite Patience. The Churches shall then know, that he is the searcher of the Reins and Hearts, and will give to every one of them according to their Works. He can call for the Whirle-wind, and Spoilers from the North, to avenge his Cause upon her. For three Transgressions of *Tyrus*, and for four, he will not turn away the Punishment thereof; he can, he will find a way to make her and her Shepherds lament and howl; and tho' she flatters her self with the Promise of Perpetuity, and saith in her Heart, I shall never be moved, usurping the Stile of the one holy Catholick and Apostolick Church, yet he can do unto her as unto the *Midianites*, as to *Sisera*, as to *Jabin*, as to the Princes of *Zeba*, and *Salmanna*, and make her as the Dung of

of the Earth. He can * call for another *Alarick*, not only to sack, but utterly to destroy her; he can make another *Lewis* stamp upon his Coins, *Perdam Nomen Babylonis*, and another after him fulfil the Inscription. The Kings of the Earth, whom she hath made drunk with the Cup of her Inchantment, he can cause to hate the Whores and make her desolate, and naked, and eat her Flesh, and burn her with Fire. Do you think, Sir, that the four once great, and glorious Oriental Churches of *Jerusalem*, *Antioch*, *Alexandria* and *Constantinople*, which you now despise, were Sinners above all other Churches; I tell you, nay, but except your Church, your Church which exalts her Throne above the Stars of God, your Church which takes upon her to be the Mother and Mistress of all Churches, your Church which still thinks she sits as Queen; unless *she* repent and reform, she shall be brought into their condition, if not finally perish. I am no Prophet, nor a Prophet's Son, but take upon me to foretel, that if she will still ascend above the height of the Clouds, and be as *Lucifer*, like the most High, she shall be brought down as low, as Hell. God can make the *Horsemen of Euphrates* trample upon her, as well, as upon the Oriental Churches; he can pull down the Cross from the Dome of *San Pietro*, and plant the Crescent in its place. Something he will do, to something he will call to destroy her; he will hiss for the Flie, and send for the Hornet, unless she repents and amends. May she rather prevent her Ruin by her Reformation. May God of his Mercy to the Christian

* *Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib. vii. cap. x.* Οὐκ ἐστὶν ἕπον ἐθνον· ἴης ἐπὶ τὰ ἐνὶ ποσὶν οὐκ· ἀλλὰ τις καὶ ἐκαστὸν ὀχλὸν μοι βασανίζον, καὶ λέγων· ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔθους τῶν Ῥωμαίων πρὸς θεὸν πόνον.

World, send a double, a *decuple* Portion of *Marcellus* the Second's Reforming Spirit upon his Successors, and fill the *Conclave*, as he did the House, where the Apostles met on the Day of *Pentecost*, with his Holy Spirit, that *Rome* may again become a holy Catholick and Apostolick Church indeed, and all the Churches of her Communion be at last delivered from the Bondage of Corruption into the glorious Liberty of the Children of God.

CHAP. VIII.

I. **B**UT I must hasten to your second Proof of this consequence, that if our Religion were true, yours would have been none at all. It is in your Eleventh Paragraph, as follows: 2dly, *I prove it out of the foresaid 19th Article of their own Church, thus; The visible Church of Christ is a Congregation of faithful Men, in which the Sacraments be duly administred according to Christ's Ordinance: But in the Roman Catholick Church, according to their Doctrine, the Sacraments are not duly administred: Therefore the Roman Catholick Church is not, (was not when they left it,) the visible (nor a visible) Church of Christ.* Sir, I grant both your Premisses and your Conclusion, from this Definition of the Church, For the Church of *Rome* is neither the visible, nor a visible Church of faithful Men, in which the Sacraments are duly administred according to Christ's Ordinance, but a Church of unfaithful Men in which the Sacraments are not duly administred according to Christ's Ordinance; and therefore she is neither the visible, nor a visible Church. I grant you more than you require, for

for I do not allow, that you administer Baptism duly; and yet, tho' you administer both Sacraments corruptly, but the one much more corruptly than the other, doth it follow from thence, that you are no Church at all, because in the Scholastical, or Theological sense of the word *Visible*, [for the *Cætus fidelium*,] you are neither the, nor a visible Church? Indeed, in the civil, or vulgar signification of the word, you are a *visible corrupt Church*, or, if you please, a Church most *visibly corrupted* in Doctrine, Worship and Polity; for which Reason, you can neither be the visible, or a visible Church, in the Theological sense of the word, in which it is [restrained to signifie] in general, the true holy Catholick Apostolick Church dispersed over the Earth, or particularly any part of it, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments duly administered according to Christ's Ordinance. But your Argument is formed upon the civil use of the word in common Conversation, and not as it signifies in Controversie, and in the Schools; and thus you pervert our unskillful People with Fallacies; you jingle our straying Sheep from our safe to your pernicious Fold, from us, and from the Truth, and from the Visible, or Catholick Church of *England*, to your Uncatholick Church, with ambiguous sounds of words, for which you must one Day give an account to God. The Catholick Church of Christ, or Universality of faithful Believers, came, as I observed before, to be called the *Visible Church*, because it ordinarily holdeth visible Assemblies, in which it useth external Worship, and Sacraments, and maketh open Professions of the Apostolick Faith, and teacheth nothing as necessary to Salvation, that is dubious, false, or damnable. This visible Church
is

is not confined to place, nor to any number of Persons beyond so many, as may make a publick Assembly. And wherever it is, it is conspicuous and discernable by the lustre of its pure Doctrine, Worship and Ministry, excepting some seasons, of Persecution, and like a light set on a Hill, which cannot be hid, it shines wheresoever it appears in the Eyes of Jews, Gentiles and Herericks, and thereby calls, and invites them unto it; and all diligent Enquirers, who come to any part of it, may easily discern it by the purity of its Doctrine, Worship and Ministry, as by a light, that it is the true Catholick Church. Such a Church as this, greater, or less, Christ will always have in some part of the World, and such a Church ours is, as it stands reformed from yours, which is a *true*, but not a good Church, *true*, or real in verity of Essence, tho' no part of the *visible* Church, in this strict Thological Sense of the Schools.

II. Your third proof in your twelfth Paragraph is of the same fallacious sort, and therefore I need but transcribe it to refute it. 3dly, *Out of the foresaid Article, the visible Church is a Congregation of faithful Men, in which the pure word of God is preached, &c. But in the Roman Catholick Church, according to their Doctrine, the pure word of God is not preached, Therefore the Roman Catholick Church is not, nor was not when they went from it, the visible (or a visible) Church of Christ.* Sir, I grant the whole, for in its best and purest state, it never was the *visible Church*, but only a glorious part of it, but it is now many Hundred Years since it was a *visible Church*, or a *Congregation of faithful Men*, &c. But because it is neither the *visible*, nor a *visible Church*, neither the pure Catholick, nor a pure Catholick Church, therefore

there
Bein
ceat
idola
abov
they
ed th
phet
think
spres
thro
whe
ans
bein
tilifi
ing
Son
but
wer
wet
bec
allo
tion
stan
Par
you
not
for
you
gre
—
†
dam
dis
tis
Com
gem
adv

therefore is it no Church at all? Did it lose its Being with its Purity, or cease to be, when it ceased to be good? What think you of the corrupt idolatrous Churches of *Judea* and *Israel*, described above, and of *Pergamus* and *Thyatira*? Were they Churches, or were they not, when God taxed them with their Corruptions, and sent his Prophets by word, or writing to reform them? What think you of the heretical idolatrous Arian Church spread over the face of the Empire, and diffused through the Oriental and Occidental Churches, when † almost all the Latin Churches turned Arians? Did their Heresie, or Idolatry, destroy their being, as Churches? Were they in a state of Gentilism, and become no Churches at all for denying the Divinity, and eternal Generation of the Son, and worshipping what they believed to be but a meer Man? Or will you, dare you say they were incapable of being reformed, because they were no Churches, nor had any Christianity at all, because their Religion was corrupt? Will you allow this way of arguing against their Reformation, which you use here against ours? Will you stand to the same consequences in both cases? Pardon me, Sir, if I presume to say you will not, you dare not. You will not, because you cannot answer the Arguments of *St. Hierom* in his fore-cited Dialogue against the *Luciferians*; and you dare not, because you dare not oppose so great an Authority, and stand to the consequence

† Item quando Arianorum, venenum non jam portiunculam quandam, sed pene Orbem totum contaminaverat, adeo ut prope cunctis Latinis Sermonis Episcopis partim vi, partim fraude deceptis Caligo quadam mentis offunderetur, &c. Vincent Lirinensis Common. Cap. vi. vid. Faustini Presbyteri libellum precum. Ingermit totus Orbis, & Arianum se esse miratus est. Hieronymus adversus Luciferian,

of your Argument against the Reformation of almost the whole Universal Church? If then you will not, you dare not stand to your own Argument, and its consequences, take a little shame to your self, and be humbled, as it were in Sack-cloath, and Ashes, for seducing half instructed People by such Sophistry, or fallacious reasoning, as affects your very *Mission*, and makes all your, and your *Fellow-Missioners* endeavours to reconcile our Church void, and to no purpose, and all your Labour vain. For according to your Doctrine, the Church of *England* is not a visible true Church, and therefore by your Argument it is no Church. It cannot be a real Church by your Logick, which, according to your Doctrine, is so corrupt in all the parts of its Constitution, and not *Cetus fidelium*, but *Cetus malignantium*, all Heresie, and Schism. Consider then, Sir, and tell me, doth the Heresie, and Schism, and other corruptions in Doctrine, Worship, and Discipline, which you impute to it, destroy its Being, because they destroy its Rectitude and Purity? If they do, why do you endeavour to reconcile us? Can you make a Church of no Church by my meer Reconciliation? That is impossible, because, if your Arguments are true, a corrupt Church is no Church, and a corrupt Religion, no Religion at all. You profess and believe *the Catholick Faith*, which the † Council of *Trent* confesses in the *Constantinopolitan Creed*, and acknowledges to be the very Doctrine, against which the Gates of Hell shall not prevail, and that really makes you to be a Christian Church, as to Doctrine, because you hold to the foundation of Christianity; but because [you have determined many uncertain, and other false

Doctrines and Tenets to be true, which you cannot prove, and anathematise the Opposers of them] and have added not only many uncertain, and dubious, but false, and absurd, or impossible; yea impious, and pernicious Doctrines to the old Creed, [not only to be assented to as conditions of Communion, but] as necessary to be taught, and believed in order to Salvation; That makes you to be a most erroneous, and corrupt Church, from which all the Christian World [in your Communion] ought to reform, because all that impure mixture with the Ancient, Catholick, Apostolical Faith, you call without any distinction, *the true Catholick Faith out of which no Man can be saved.* In like manner, as to Worship, you have in your Offices some ancient, chaste, pure Invocations of the Holy Trinity, and some Prayers unto God in primitive Purity through Jesus Christ, and his Merits, and this is Christian Worship; but then you have also Prayers [exceedingly corrupt, in some of which you ask Blessings of God by the Merits, and Intercession of Saints †, without any mention of Christ, or his Merits, or Intercession, and in others,

† *Hanc veram Catholicam fidem, extra quam nemo Salvus esse potest. Bulla Pii IV. super forma Juramenti professionis Fidei.*

‡ *Deus, qui de beata Maria Virginis utero verbum tuum, Angelo nuntiante, Carnem suscipere voluisti. Præsta supplicibus tuis, ut qui vere eam Genetricem Dei credimus, ejus apud te intercessionibus adjuvemur. Dominica iii. adventus in Misale Rom.*

Hæc nos communio, Domine, purget a crimine, & intercedente beata Virgine, Dei Genetrice Maria, Cælestis remedii facias esse Confortes. See many more of this kind in a discourse, intitled, Speculum Beate Virginis, London printed 1686.

which

which indeed you conclude *per Dominum*, * you blend their Intercession and Merits with his, and so debase, and pollute the Devotions, in which you use his holy, and meritorious Name.] You have also direct Prayers, and Intercessions to Saints, to whom you pray in postures of adoration before their || *consecrated* Images, and you pray to Christ before the Image of his humane Nature, [and as I have shew'd before, you worship the Cross] and you † adore the *Host* after Consecration, and elevate it to be adored by the People with divine Worship [and at certain times expose it ‡ and carry it about for adoration] and these impure and idolatrous mixtures (which have long called for Reformation) with the purer parts of your Worship, pollute your [daily Sacrifices] and whole divine Service, and makes your Communion so corrupt, that all Christians are obliged to leave your Church, lest they partake of her Sins, and Plagues. In like manner, as to the *Polity and Ministry* of the

*——*Gloriosa semper Virginis Maria*——*beatorum Apostolorum, ac Martyrum tuorum, & omnium Sanctorum, quorum meritis precibusque concedas, ut in omnibus protectionis tue muniamur auxilio, per eundem Christum dominum nostrum. Amen. In. Can. Missæ. See more such in Speculum Beata Virginis.*

|| Pontificale Romanum, pars 1. de benedictione, imag. B. *Maria Virg. & aliorum Sanctorum.*

† *Prolatis verbis Consecrationis statim Consecratam genusexus adorat, surgit, ostendit populo, In Can. Missæ. Tunc se erigens—elevat in altum Hostiam—populo reverenter ostendit adorandam. Celebrans, adorato Sacramento, surgit, & discooperit calicem—genusexus Sanguinem reverenter adorat. Tum se erigit, & accipiens calicem discooperit cum Sanguine, ambabus manibus, ut prius, elevat eum, & erectum ostendit populo adorandum. Ritus Servandus in Celebratione Missæ, viii.*

‡ *Concil. Trident. Sess. XIII. Cap. V. Can. VI.*

Church,

Church
lical
from
Doct
ther a
Fidel
shops
take
ceive

†
Ele
hora
lo, &
‡
first
mann
dian
fine
tanor
politi
nem
auct
potes
Hinc
fund
que
devo
eran
tio
um
Qua
Epi
futi
copo
Ver
con
the
Ch
Po
XI

Church, you indeed retain the primitive Apostolical Institution of Bishops, an Order distinct from, and superiour to Presbyters, but then your Doctrine of the Roman Churches being the Mother and Mistress of all Churches : † The Oath of Fidelity and Subjection, which not only all Bishops, but all Archbishops, or Metropolitans must take to the Pope at Consecration, before they receive the ‡ Pall, by which in your Church the

† *Forma juramenti in Pontificali Romano de consecratione Electi in Episcopum* : Ego N. electus Ecclesie N. ab hac hora in antea fidelis, & obediens ero beato Petro Apostolo, &c.

‡ Of the *Pall*. One of your own Doctors, Du Pin, in his first Dissertation, *de Antiqua Ecclesia disciplina*, writes in this manner, §. XII. *Succedente vero tempore pontifices Romani ordinandorum per universum occidentem Episcoporum potestatem non sine multa contradictione sibi vindicare, & omnium Metropolitanorum jura paulatim pessumdederunt. Primum quidem Metropolitana ordinationum jura ad se trahere conati sunt per Concessionem PALLII. Eo enim dabatur a pontificibus, ut possent plena auctoritate sua provincia Episcopos ordinare, unde sequebatur hanc potestatem a Pontifice Metropolitanis simul cum PALLIO concedi. Hinc postea novo jure Metropolitanis interdictum est, universis functionibus Episcopalibus, donec Pallium recipissent, juramentumque FIDEI introductum est. Secundo ad Pontificem Romanum devoluta sunt appellationes judiciorum, quae a Metropolitanis latae erant circa Controversias, quae in electionibus occurrebant. Tercio si Electores essent negligentes, aut si hominem minime idoneum elegissent, devolvebatur electio ad Pontificem Romanum. Quarto Romano Episcopo reservatum est jus admittendi Cessiones Episcopatum, decernendique translationes, & coadjutorias cum futura Successione. Demum confirmatio Electionum omnium Episcoporum ipsi concessa. Quod jus Concordatis confirmatum est. Veruntamen ad duodecimum usque seculum facta testia jura sua conservaverunt in Gallia Metropolitani.* And how contrary all these Papal Encroachments are to the Liberty of Christ's Church, and the ancient Suburbicarian Jurisdiction of the Popes may be seen in the same Book of that great Man, §. XI, XII, XIII. of the same Dissertation.

* Plenitude

* Plenitude of the Episcopal Office, and the Powers of it are conferred; The Oath of Obedience, which all Ecclesiasticks regular, and secular, must also make to the Bishop of Rome, as Successor to St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar-General of Jesus Christ: In a word, the Doctrine of the Pope's Sovereignty, or being Supreme Head of the Catholick Church, is so contrary to the ancient Principles of Church-Government, and the primitive Rights and Immunities of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, and hath so enslaved the free Episcopate, and alter'd the face of it in your Church, that it is no more like what it was, and ought to be, than your Worship is like the pure primitive Worship, or your New, like to the Old Creed. But then because you retain the ancient Creeds, and have in your Offices for Worship, many chaste and pure Prayers, and also retain the primitive Hierarchical Order and Ministry, by Bishops, Priests and Deacons, you are a real Church, but because you have added new and pernicious Doctrines to the pure old Creeds; impure to your pure Worship; and enslaved the whole Clergy, and particularly the Episcopal Order to the Pope; you are not morally a holy, and true, or a Catholick, Aposto-

* *Tradimus tibi Pallium de Corpore Beati Petri sumptum, in quo est Plenitudo Pontificalis Officii. Et quia Pontificalis Officii plenitudo confertur per Pallium, antequam obtinerit quis Pallium, licet sit consecratus, non sortitur Nomen Patriarchæ Primatis, aut Archiepiscopi; & non licet in Episcopos consecrare, nec convocare ad Concilium; nec Chrisma consecrare; nec Ecclesias dedicare; nec Clericos ordinare; etiam si Pallium in alia Ecclesia habuisset, cum oporteat petere novum Pallium. Pontificale Romanum de Pallio. Non tamen deberet se Archiepiscopum appellare prius, quam a nobis Pallium suscepisset, in quo Pontificalis Officii plenitudo cum Archiepiscopalis nominis appellatione confertur. Decret. Gregor. Lib. i. Tit. viii. Cap. iii.*

lical,

lital, but in all the Parts of your Ecclesiastical Constitution, a most corrupt uncatholick Church. Do but follow our Example, and reform; do but set back your Church to what it was a thousand Years before the Council of *Trent*, and then of a *real* Church, which you are, and for whose Reformation I daily pray, you will recommence a right and true Church.

II. FROM your Proofs, I pass to your *Consequences*, [which you say are of great importance, but] which can be of no greater importance than your Proofs; and therefore your Proofs being so plainly disproved, your Consequences from them can be of no importance at all, though you introduce them with great shew, to raise Expectation, in your Thirteenth Paragraph. Thus, say you, *have I proved, that according to their Principles the Roman Catholick Church was not a Church of Christ, when they pretended to reform it.* To which I answer without any *Thus*, that you have tricked, and shamefully trifled and wasted your Ink and Paper, and proved nothing at all. But let us go on: *It follows, first, that no Protestant Church could reform it, no more than one can wash a Face that hath no Being.* But I have proved it had a Being, and having a Being it did reform it self, as a Sloven may wash his own dirty Face. Then it follows; *So that they are not a reformed Religion, but absolutely a new Religion, i. e. a false Religion; for it is evident, their Religion is new, if it was not reformed.* But I have shewn that it is not a new, but a renewed and reformed Religion, which retains the Pure, and rejected all the impure Additions, which you still keep. What our Church hath now, it had before it reformed it self, though it hath not all that it had, because it had much more than it ought to have

M

had.

had. You know, the Church is often taken synecdochically for the Clergy, and the Clergy of the Church of England reformed themselves, and the Doctrine, Worship, and Polity of their Church. They sifted the Popish Chaff from the Primitive Wheat, the Dross and baser Mixtures from the pure Metal. They retained that, which while they were a corrupt Popish, made them a real Church, and by throwing off all the Popish Errors, Innovations, Abuses and Corruptions, they recommenced a true, pure Catholick Church. To heal a Sore, (* saith an ingenious Gentleman of our Church,) to purge a sick, and diseased Body, is not to make a new Body, but to renew it, and restore it to its former Health. Let me give you but one familiar Example of your own in this latter Age: St. Francis established the Order of Franciscans, and they, according to the meaning of their first Founder, did for a long time follow the Institution of their first Orders. Afterwards, when certain Errors, and Corruptions had crept in among them, some separated themselves from the rest, and were called the Recollects. Upon this occasion, a Suit was commenced, to decide whether the Recollects, or the other Franciscans, did adhere to the true Order of St. Francis. After Examination, and Deliberation had, the Recollects were found to adhere to the ancient Institutions of their Order; and thereupon Judgment was published on their behalf, and they were afterwards called the Reformed Franciscans. Such (* saith he) is the State of the Reformed Churches at this day: The true Church was first planted, and established by Christ, and his Apostles, which continued sound

Sir Humphrey Lynde in the Preface to his Via Devina.

in Head, and Members for many Ages; but afterwards, when Error, and Superstition had crept in, and gotten the upper-hand, there were certain Recollects, who complained of the Corruptions, and Errours, which had sprung up in the Roman Church. Whereupon, after mature Deliberation had of the true Doctrine of Christ, and his Apostles, publication was made in behalf of the Recollects, that they were found to adhere to the Institutions of Christ, and his Apostles; and from that time, they were called the Reformed Churches.

CHAP. IX.

I NOW proceed to your Fourteenth Paragraph, in which, with a presumption common to all your Curial Doctors, you speak of Rome Christian, as *URBS ÆTERNA*, in arrogating to her the Promises of perpetual Duration. It follows, (say you) 3dly, That the Roman Catholick Church is the true Church: For some Church must be the true Church of Christ; and it can be none, to whom the Promises of Indefeasibility, or perpetual Duration have not been made good: But these Promises have not been made good to any, but the Roman Catholick Church, and have evidently fail'd all Protestants for the space of 900, or 1000 Years: Therefore the Roman Catholick Church is the true Church of Christ. Sir, this Paragraph is resolvable into two plain categorical Syllogisms, whereof this is the first. Some one Church must be the true Church of Christ; but no Church but the Roman Catholick Church is

that one true Church. Therefore the Roman Catholick Church must be the true Church of Christ. Let us examin each of the Premisses of this Syllogism in order: *Some one Church must be the true Church of Christ.* To which I answer, that *the true Church of Christ* is taken either in the general signification, for the one holy Catholick Church of all the Faithful dispersed over the Earth, of which Christ alone is the Head, or in the particular signification for *this*, or *that* particular Church, which in some part or other of the Earth, is a Member of the one holy Catholick Church. In the former signification, in which you [still abusively] take it, this Proposition is not only false, but a contradiction, because *some Church*, that is, some one particular Church cannot be the whole Church of Christ: For if it is the whole Church, it cannot be some one Church, as I have shewed above. The second, or minor Proposition is this; *But no Church, but the Roman Catholick Church, is that one true Church:* Which is false; because, as I have proved above, it is neither the true Church, nor a true Church of Christ, as true signifies sound, pure, or truly Catholick in a moral sense; and therefore your Conclusion is false, which is this, *Therefore the Roman (miscalled) Catholick Church must be the true Church of Christ.*

II. THE second Syllogism, by which you prove the minor Proposition, is this; *No Church, to which the Promises of Indefectibility, or perpetual Duration, have not been made good, is the true Church of Christ: But those Promises have not been made good to any, but the Roman Catholick Church: Therefore the Roman Catholick Church is the true Church of Christ.* Sir, the truth and certainty of this Conclusion

clufio
eviden
us, w
the P
it, ar
havin
they
Propo
of Ina
been
Churc
mises
on, &
suppo
we m
down
that
other
defect
Prop
you
instea
be tru
is hin
pass
as giv
I cha
you
will
and y
Carab
mean
Chur
Perse
Chur
the P
them

clusion ought to be made out from most sure and
 evident Principles, if you would convince any of
 us, who are not Members of your Church: But
 the Principles, from which you go about to prove
 it, are neither sure, nor true; and so far from
 having any evidence of truth and certainty, that
 they are clearly false. I'll begin *with the major*
Proposition: No Church to which the Promises
of Indefectibility, or perpetual Duration have not
been made good, is the true Church of Christ. No
Church, i. e. no one Church, to which the Pro-
misses of Indefectibility, and perpetual Durati-
on, &c. Here, Sir, after your usual manner, you
 suppose what is not true, take for granted, what
 we never granted to you, and shamefully lay it
 down, as a Principle without any previous Proof,
that there is some one particular Church above all
others, to which Christ made the Promises of In-
defectibility, or Duration. Before you made this
 Proposition a *Premise* to infer such a Conclusion,
 you ought to have made good proof of it; but
 instead of proving it, you doughtily suppose it to
 be true; and a bold Supposition in a Guide, who
 is himself supposed not capable to deceive, will
 pass for an Argument with such easie Profelytes,
 as give up themselves to his Conduct. But, Sir,
 I challenge you to prove this Proposition; and if
 you can make clear and substantial proof of it, I
 will surrender my self, and be your Profelyte;
 and you shall send me, as the Roman General did
Caracallus, to be led in triumph at Rome. In the
 mean time, I beseech you to tell me, if the
 Churches of *Sardis*, *Pergamus* and *Thyatira*, the
Persian, the *African* Churches, were not true
 Churches in their time, and yet you will not say,
 the Promises of perpetual Duration were made to
 them: You will not say it, because in your mi-

nor Proposition you say, in effect, they were made to none but the Church of *Rome*; for if they were made good to none but the Church of *Rome*, then they were made to none but the Church of *Rome*, because God makes no Promises, which he doth not make good. Likewise you will not say it, because they have been utterly destroyed, and are become like the Dead, as if they had never been. I pray you also to tell me, if the Four Patriarchal Churches of the East, *Jerusalem*, *Antioch*, *Alexandria*, and *C. P.* (two whereof are ancients than that of *Rome*,) were not, and as much as you despise them, still are true Churches, tho', according to your Doctrine, the Promises of Indefectibility, or perpetual Duration were not made to them; and if these, without Christ's making, or making good these Promises to them, were, and are true Churches, and the first, for some time after the beginning of Christianity, the only true, and Catholick Church of Christ; then it is false, that no one Church can be the true Church of Christ, to which the Promises of perpetual Duration have not been made good.

III. HAVING examined your *major*, let us proceed to your *minor* Proposition, which is this; *But those Promises have not been made good to any but the Roman Catholick Church.* The Promises you mean, are in *Matth.* xvi. 17, 18, 19. xxviii. 20. *Luke* xxii. 32. *John* xv. 16. xvi. 13. not to mention what your *Curial* Writers are wont to argue in their way, from *Rom.* i. 8. But to say, they have not been made good to any but the Roman Catholick Church, is to suppose they have been made only to the Roman Church; which is false, because they have been made to no one Church at all. I challenged you above, to prove
that

that Christ made these Promises to any particular Church; and now I challenge you, to prove he made them to the Church of Rome; and if you cannot prove that, how will you prove that he made them only to that Church, or to none but that? They were made to the whole Hierarchical State, or Ministry of the Gospel, and by consequence to the Church in general, as the Command † *Pasce Agnos, Pasce Oves meas*, John xxi. was given in the Person of St. Peter to the Hierarchical State, in all succeeding Times, and by consequence to the whole Pastoral, or Governing Church. There is, no doubt to be made of the Doctrine of the Church's Indeficiency, and of the Obligation of Christ, its Head, and High Priest, who is faithful and just to preserve it, so that it shall not quite fail, or be destroy'd either by ‡ Heresie, Apostacy, or outward Violence and Persecution, which are the ways by which the Powers of Hell endeavour to destroy it; No, he will so defend his Catholick Church, that it shall neither quite fall away from him, by falling off from the ancient Catholick and Apostolical Faith and Ministry, nor be quite extinguished by Persecution, which the Ancients always ascribed to the instigation of the Devils, but he will

† *Augustini Expositiones in Evang. Joh. Tractatus CXXIV.* See Launoy Epist. ad N. Gatinaum, and Neilus, and Barlaam, of the Popes Supremacy; where those Texts are particularly vindicated from your corrupt Interpretation of them.

‡ *Ipsa est Ecclesia sancta, Ecclesia una, Ecclesia vera, Ecclesia Catholica contra omnes haereses pugnans, pugnare potest, expugnari tamen non potest. Haereses omnes — exierint tanquam sarmenta inutilia de vite praeclisa, ipsa autem manet in radice sua, in vite sua, in charitate sua; porta inferorum non vincunt eam.* August. de Symbolo ad Catechumenos, Tom. IX,

always have a Church upon Earth, which shall retain the Apostolical Faith, and Ministry, by Tradition and Succession from the Apostles, tho' both your Church and ours had lost their Being, and become no Churches, by Heresie, Apostacy, or Persecution. He can remove your Candlestick when he pleases, to any other place where they yet sit in Pagan Darkness, and in the Region and Shadow of Death. *There are many barren places, which are yet to rejoice; and as God did formerly chuse: so I am persuaded he will again chuse the foolish things of the World to confound the Wise, and the weak things of it to confound the things that are Mighty; nay, base things in the Eye of the World, and your worldly Church, will he chuse, and things which are despised, and things that are not, to bring to naught things that are, that no Flesh should glory in his Presence.* He can call the *Jews*, and make *Jerusalem* the true Mother of us all, which now dwelleth among the Heathen, once again great among the Nations, and restore the Daughter of *Sion*, which hath long mourned, to her former Beauty, and make *Jewry* once more a Holy Land, and the Joy and Glory of the whole Earth. He can plant as glorious a Church in the South, as he once had in the North of *Africk*; he can call the *Hotentots* and *Tartars*, and most savage *Americans*, as easily as he did the *Goths*, and *Britains* to the Faith; and all this he can do, tho' your Church were no more; and all that he is obliged to do by the Promises of Indefectibility or Perpetuity, is some where or other to have a pure Church upon Earth; I mean, so pure that one may communicate in it without sin. The Church Catholick began in one single Congregation; and should he have but one single Congregation upon Earth,

at

at the
would
no mor
as to t
he wil
preserv
himsel

IV.

Perpet
Churc
abstur
made
For a
not c
tuater
this t
voura
part
pleat
thof
tuat
Branc
good
ating
and
mak
Eng
and
Ear
pre
tho
wh
fre
nor
till
co
an

at the end of the World, yet those Promises would be fulfilled, because they obliged him to no more, than still to preserve his Church; but as to the number or greatness of Churches, which he will preserve, and the Places where he will preserve them, he hath made no Promise, but left himself free.

IV. HAVING shewed, that the Promises of Perpetuity were not made to any one particular Church, I cannot but observe how improper and absurd it is in you to say, *They have not been made good to any, but the Roman Catholick Church.* For although the Roman Catholick Church hath not ceased to be, but hath been hitherto perpetuated for so many Ages; yet its Indeficiency to this time proceeds from the mere Grace and favourable Providence of God, who preserves one part of his Church and destroys another, as he pleases; and not from his Veracity in fulfilling those Promises, which only oblige him to perpetuate his Catholick Church, but not any one Branch or Member thereof. Indeed he may make good those Promises, if he pleases, in perpetuating the Roman Church to the end of the World, and letting others quite perish. But so he may make them good in perpetuating the Church of *England*, as I trust he will, or any other Church, and letting that utterly perish from off the Earth, and in what particular Church, or Churches present, or to come, he will perpetuate his Catholick Church to the end of the World, or in what state, or degree of Peace, and Purity, or freedom from Error, is only known to himself, nor can be known to Man without a Revelation, till the last Day. *2dly*, As to the Blessing of a continued Preservation, which the Roman Church arrogates to it self under the Name of *Perpetuity*,
it

it hath been hitherto granted to many Churches, as well as to her. The Church of *Jerusalem*, which is elder Sister to the Church of *Rome*, hath continued, tho' not flourished, from its first Foundation. The Church of the *Abyssine Ethiopia*, founded by the care of St. *Athanasius*, hath continued and flourished without interruption, from the first day of its Being, to this present day; and so has the Church which was founded in *Great Britain*, continued, tho' not always flourished (which is promised to no part of the *Militant Church*) from the time of its first Plantation in the Reign of *Tiberius Caesar* to this day. The Faith of Christ was preached here, in all probability, as soon as in *Rome* it self, and hath been conveyed down to us from that time to this, by a continued Succession of a lawful Ministry, by Bishops, Priests and Deacons. Our *Saxon* Ancestors had their Bishops partly from the *Scotish*, and partly from the *Roman Church*; and as we are equal to you in a lawful Succession of Bishops, and by consequence of Priests, without interruption, so we have this Advantage over you, that together with the Blessing of Perpetuity to this time, we have the happiness to be reformed from the common Errors and Corruptions in which we were both equally involved. I have added this, because you have the confidence to assert, That *the Promises of Indefectibility and Perpetuity have evidently failed all Protestants, for the space of 900, or 1000 Years*; though we have continued a Church without interruption, as long as you, and at present, by the Mercy of God, are in a much purer state.

V. I TAKE no notice of the crudity and absurdity of your Expression, in saying, those Promises have failed all Protestants for the space of 900,

900,
then p
be ca
had n
such
pish
To co
Noab
Moun
about
son a
God
Chur
Arm
appr
to de
in th
Altr
me
wa
in r
to
the
nor
go
go
A
th
a
w
sh

re
it
m
t
t

900, or 1000 Years, as if our Ancestors, who then professed our Faith, and not yours, could be called Protestants, in propriety of Speech, who had no such Popish Errors and Corruptions, no such Popish Abuses and Innovations, nor any Popish new Creeds to protest against, as we have. To conclude, Sir, That part of *Asia*, into which *Noah* and his Family went forth of the Ark, near Mount *Ararath*, (now thought to be *Armenia*,) about the rise of *Tigris*, may with as much reason arrogate to it self the general Promise, which God made, *never to destroy the Earth again*, as your Church arrogate the Promises of Perpetuity. I say, *Armenia*, by the same way of Reasoning, may appropriate to it self the general Promise, *never to destroy the Earth again*, because it was made in that Country to *Noah*, after he had built an Altar, and sacrificed there. And therefore give me leave to expose your false and presumptuous way of Reasoning, to make an *Armenian* use it in this manner: Some Country must be the place, to which God made the Promise of never cursing the Ground again with a Flood; and it can be none to which that Promise hath not been made good; but that Promise hath not been made good to any Country, but *Armenia*. Therefore *Armenia* must be the place, to which God made the Promise of never cursing the Ground again with a Flood. Sir, I beseech you, look back upon your way of proving, and compare it with this, and then shew me the difference between them, if you can.

VI. YOUR Sixteenth Paragraph being but a repetition of what I have answered, I shall pass it over without any farther trouble, than to animadvert upon two Expressions in it: *We follow the Guidance of the Church, they their own. Either their Religion, or ours, is a damnable Heresie.*
As

As to the first, it is great arrogance in you, to say you follow the Guidance of the Church. If that be true, will you shew us your Religion, wherein it differs from ours, in the purest Ages of the Church for the first 500 Years? You have asked me, where our Religion was 900, or 1000 Years before *Luther*; and I have shewed you where it then was, even where the Popish part of your Religion then was not, all over the Christian World, particularly in the Church of *England*; and if you cannot shew me the like of your Religion, then it is impossible you should follow the Guidance of the Church. If you followed the Guidance of the Church, you would have Catholick Tradition, and Scripture expounded by Catholick Tradition on your side. But Catholick Tradition, which consists in Antiquity, Universality and Consent, is against you; for instead of Antiquity, you have set up Novelty; instead of Universality, your own particular Traditions; and, instead of Consent, only the Testimony and Authority of your own representative Church in the Council of *Trent*, whose Definitions you miscall the Guidance of the Church. * A packed Council it was, that was neither free, nor general; not free, because the Pope, the chief Person to be reformed, was President of it, and proposed all things by his *Legates*, and because none had Suffrage in it but such as were sworn to him and the Church of

* Relation of the Conference between Archbishop *Land* and Mr. *Fisher*, printed at London M DCLXXIII. p. 140. defended against the Exceptions of *Labyrinthus Cantuariensis*, by Dr. *Stillingsfleet*, in his *Rational Account*, &c. printed M DCLXXXI. chap. viii.

Rome.
genera
in it,
presen
of Chr
there
none,
Frenc
as for
Chur
uncer
rity,
lants
the C
cil,
were
no S
wh
Ital
We
fall
hav
Sir
tho
pac
cal
tiv
by
re
C
yo

tin
M
fi
S

Rome. And as it was not free, so neither was it general: For the *Greek Churches* had no Bishops in it, who were chosen and sent by them, to represent them in it. And as for the *Western Parts of Christendom*, in all the Sessions under *Paul III.* there were but two *French Men*, and sometimes none, as in the sixth under *Julius III.* when the *French King* protested against the Council. And as for *England*, there was but one Bishop of that Church in it, the *Bishop of St. Asaph*; and it is uncertain, whether he was sent thither by Authority, or no. For Pope *Leo* declared the *Appellants Hereticks*, before they were condemned by the Council; and so it was not a lawful Council, but an assembly of Enemies. Besides, there were many *Curial* titular Bishops in it, who had no Subsistence, but the Pope's Purse; and of the whole number that sat in it, there were more *Italian Bishops* by 104, than of all the *Christian World* besides; and by such a Majority, his *Infallibility* might infallibly assure himself to have whatsoever he would determined. Thus, Sir, you did not follow the guidance of the *Catholick Church*, but your own; and yet this packed Synod * insolently styles it self *œcumenical*, and speaks of it self, as of the *Representative of the Catholick Church*, and to be guided by the *Holy Ghost*, which I need not put you in remembrance of, who told us was sent to the Council in the Pope's Port-manteau. And truly, you follow the Guidance of the Church, in fol-

* *Sessio I. Sacrosancti œcumenici & generalis Concilii Tridentini sub Paulo III. — celebrata.*

|| *Sessio XXV. Cum Catholica Ecclesia spiritu sancto edocta — Novissime in hac œcumenica Synodo docuerit Purgatorium. — Sessio XVI. Sacrosancta œcumenica & generalis Synodus, in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregata.*

following that Council, as much, as that Council followed the guidance of the Holy Ghost, in following the Pope, and how much that was, let its own definitions and the Creed of *Pius IV.* speak. On the contrary, we follow both the Example and Guidance of the Church. Its Example, in making use of our own right to call a National Synod for Reformation, when we could not obtain it by a General Council; and its Guidance, in making Scripture, expounded by Catholick Tradition, our Rule of Faith. We follow Antiquity, Universality, and Consent, and therefore we follow the Church, the primitive Church; to her and her General Councils we appeal against you, and your particular Council of *Trent*, and by the consentient Doctrines of her Fathers, we offer, we desire to be tried.

VII. AND, whereas you assert, that either your Religion or ours is a damnable Heresie, you may take as much of damnable Heresie to yourselves, as you deserve. But as for us, I challenge you to shew any one damnable or dangerous Heresie, or heretical Doctrine, that we profess. Nay, I challenge you to shew any one dangerous, positive, or negative Doctrine, that the Church of *England* holds, or that she doth not hold all things needful to Salvation. But if false and dangerous, or absurd and impossible, nay pernicious and impious Doctrines, contrary to Scripture expounded by Catholick Tradition, derogatory to the Honour of Jesus Christ, and the Christian Religion, and destructive of the Rights and Liberties of the Catholick Church be damnable Heresies, then your Religion, by which I mean *the Popery of it*, is a multiform damnable Heresie, as we doubt not, but a truly Free and General Council, could such a one be had, would soon

determine,

determine, and to such a Council we are ready to appeal.

VIII. SIR, I have observed throughout this Answer to your Reply, how falsely, fallaciously, and precariously you arrogate the glorious Titles of the Church, the Church of Christ; the Catholick Church, the Holy Catholick, Apostolick Church; and the one Holy Catholick Church, &c. to your Church, i. e. to the Church of Rome, and those Churches which communicate with her, exclusively of all others. So all your English Writers that I have read, do, contracting the Catholick Church to the Roman Church and Communion, which for that reason they call the *Roman Catholick Church*, so you [Missioners, and curial Writers] would be always understood to mean when you speak of the Tradition of the Church, the Testimony of the Church, the Authority of the Church, the Doctors and Pastors of the Church, the Voice of the Church, the attestation, or continual attestation of the Church; quite contrary to the notion of the *Catholick Church*, which the ancient Writers and Councils of it have transmitted to us, as I have shew'd, and as I have observed, the modern Writers of the Greek Church, and the most free and learned of your own, have shewed, as well as we.

IX. THE matter, or *materia ex qua*, of the Catholick Church, according to the ancient Testimonies I have produced, is † *all faithful Churches wheresoever dispersed over the World*, as being integral parts, or members of the One

† Quod sit ubique diffusa. Optatus ii. de Schism. καθ' ὅλην
καὶ οὐκ ἐκ μέρους ἕως τελευτῶν, Iren. L. i. C. ii. πῆσις καθολικὴ
ἐστὶν τῷ ἀπαντες οἱ ὀρθόδοξοι Χριστιανοὶ ὁμολογοῦσιν. Barlaam
de principatu Papæ, Cap. XV.

Body of the Holy Catholick Church. The *form* of it, as of all other politick Bodies, or Societies consists in the union or fellowship of those Members among themselves, and with their common Head. Their union and fellowship among themselves consists in professing the same common Faith, which is therefore called the *Catholick Faith*; in the administration of the same Sacraments, in having the same Government and Ministry, and in communicating with one another, in holy Offices, and in all the Acts of Christian Charity, as mutual Help and Assistance in time of Persecution, mutual Beneficence and Liberality in time of Want, mutual participation of one another's Prayers, and in whatsoever else is to be understood by the *Communion of Saints* in the Militant Church. The only head, in which, and under which they are thus united is Christ, according to that of *Theophylact* in 1 Cor. xii, which I cited before, καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία ἡ πᾶσιν ἁγίοις, &c. The Catholick Church dispersed over the whole World, whose Body consists of all Churches every where having Christ for its Head. So St. Chrysost. Homil. 1. in 1 ad Cor. ἡ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἐκκλησία, &c. The Church dispersed over the World ought to be One, tho' it is divided in many places. For tho' place separates the Faithful, yet the Lord joyns them——those that are in different places have not divers Lords, but One only, nor is their Unity hindered by difference of places, the One Lord uniting them all.

In Col. II. 10. The Apostle calls our Lord the Head of all Principality and Power. Where, as *Theodore*t upon the place observes, he * uses the

* Τὸ ΚΕΦΑΛΗ ἀντὶ τοῦ ΑΡΧΗ τέθεικε.

word *Head* for *Sovereign*, or *Supreme*. And therefore, on 1 Cor. xi. 3. he saith *Our Head is Christ, both as our Creator, and as we are his Body.*

These and all the other Authorities about the *Sovereign*, or *Supreme Head* of the *Catholick Church*, are exactly agreeable to *Holy Writ*, as *Ephes. i. 22.* where his *Sovereignty* over the *Church* is thus described: *which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in heavenly places, far above all Principality and Power, and Might, and Dominion, and every Name that is named, &c. and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be Head over all things to the Church, which is his Body.* So *Ch. iv. 11, &c.* He gave some *Apostles, &c.* for the edifying of the *Body of Christ, &c. who is the Head, &c.* So *Coloss. i. 18.* He is the *Head of the Body, the Church;* and *ii. 10.* you are compleat in him, who is the *Head of all Principality and Power.* So *Ephes. v. 23.* The *Husband* is the head of the *Wife, even as Christ is Head of the Church.* So *Rom. xii. 5.* We being many are one *Body in Christ.* So *Heb. iii. 1.* he is styled, The *Apostle and chief Priest of our Profession.* So *Eph. ii. 20.* And are built upon the foundation of the *Prophets and Apostles, Jesus Christ being the chief Corner-stone.* These Texts are urged against you by *Nectarius † Patriarch of Hierusalem* in these words: *this Church, consisting of the Patriarchal Churches, is properly called Catholick, and simply, (or abso-*

† See *Theodore* on *Pf. cxviii. 22.* and *Theophylact* on *Matth. xxi.* *Cyrril. Alex.* on *Isaiah xxviii. 16.* *Oecumen.* on 1 *Pet. cap. ii.* *Euseb. demonstrat. Evang. lib. 1. p. 19.*

‡ *Confutatio imperii Papa, p. 241.* cited at large in the *Margent* of my Answer to your Query.

lately, the Church of God, the Mother of us all, the perfect Spouse of Christ, whose Head Christ is, according to the Apostle in Eph. Chap. i. and ii. and Coloss. i. And according to Basil in his Sermon of the Judgment of God, Christ only, is the one Head of the Church. You, saith he (*considering the saying of the Apostle*) are the Body of Christ, and Members in particular, the one, and only Head, who is Christ, joining and fitting one part to another in Concord. He might have cited many more of the Greek Fathers, as Greg. Nazianz. Orat. xxxi. εἰς Χριστός, &c. One Christ, the one Head of the Church. So Theodoret on i Cor. xi. 3. Christ is the Head of every Man, i.e. of Believers. And he is our Head, not as God, but as Man. For we are called his Body, and the Head ought to be of the same nature with the Body, and therefore he is our Head, as Man. To the same purpose speaks Greg. Nyssen. against Eunomius, Orat. xii. Vol. ii. And Theodoret on cviii. Psalm. The Lord Christ is called Head of the Church, and his Body the Collection of the Church, i.e. The Church taken collectively is called his Body. So Clem. Alexandr. Strom. vii. The Church, that holy spiritual Chorus is allegorically called the Body of Christ. So Theophylact on St. John chap. xi. Christ hath gathered us together into One, into One Church and One Yoke, making one Body of those who are near, and those who are afar off, that he who dwells at Rome should esteem an Indian as his fellow Member, and confess Christ to be the Head of all. So on i Cor. xii. Because they (the Corinthians) did not make up the Body of Christ, but all the faithful all the World over, therefore he added καὶ μέλη, and Members. For tho' they were not the whole Body, yet they were Members, and
that

that in particular. For as to the Church that is among you, you are the Body of Christ, as an entire Church; But as to the Catholick Church all the World over, whose Body consists of all Churches in all places, having Christ for its Head, you are but Members, because you are but a part of that. This was as true of the Church of Rome in its purest state, as of the Church of Corinth. For the Ancients had no other notion of it, but as of one particular Church, which was a part of the whole, of which Christ only was the Head. They never used the Catholick Church in the general sense, but for the whole collective Body of all Christian Churches united under Christ, as their only Head. And when they gave the title of Catholick Church to the Church of Rome, it was in no other sense, but that in which they gave it to other particular Patriarchal, or Diocesan Churches, to signifie that they were faithful parts of the whole Church. This was the sense in which Gregory Nazianzen called the Church of C. P. the Catholick Church in the beginning and end of his last Will. Γενυδοις ἐπισκοπῶν καὶ αἵσις καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ ἐν Κωνσταντινῇ πόλει, Gregory Bishop of the Holy Catholick Church in C. P. and in this sense Polycarp is said to be Bishop of the † Catholick Church of Smyrna, but not to signifie its union with the Church of Rome, more than any other part of the Catholick Church. There were no other senses then of Catholick Church but two: This general one, in which as it was put for all faithful Churches united into one Body, under Christ, and the particular, when it was used expressly, or implicite, for a particular Church, as I have shewed before, not up-

† Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. iv. c. xv.

on the account of its union and agreement with the Roman, but with the whole Catholick Church. But Cardinal Peron to avoid the force of these two primitive senses and acceptations of *Catholick Church*, invented a third, which the Ancients never knew. It is in a passage of *Labyrinthus Cantuariensis*, and is expressed in these words. The word *Catholick* may be used in three acceptations, viz. either formally, or causally, or by way of participation. Formally, The universal Church, that is the Society of all true particular Churches, united together in one Body, in one Communion, and under one Head, is called *Catholick*. ‡ Causally, The Church of Rome is stiled *Catholick*, because it hath an influence and force to cause Universality in the whole Body of the *Catholick Church*: To which Universality two things are necessary, One is Multitude, which serves as an Analogical matter, whereof it consists. For where there is no Multitude, there can be no Universality. The other is in the place of form, viz. Unity. For Multitude without Unity will never make Universality. Take away (saith St. Augustin) Unity from Multitude, and it is *Turba* (a Rout) but joyn it to Unity, and it becomes *Populus*, a Community. The Roman Church therefore, which is a Centre of Ecclesiastical Communion, infuses this Unity, which is the form of Universality into the *Catholick Church*, and thereby causes in her Universality, may be called *Catholick causally*, tho' it be but a particular Church. So he who Commands in Chief over

‡ I think he should have said *efficiently*, because what contributes materially, or formally to make the Church *Catholick*, contributes *causally*, matter and form being two of the four Causes.

the whole Army, and makes an Unity in that military Body is stiled General, tho' he be but a particular Person. Thirdly, Every particular Orthodox Church is termed Catholick participative, by way of participation, because they agree in, and participate of the Doctrine and Communion of the Catholick Church. In this sense the Church of Smyrna addrestes her Epistle thus: To the Catholick Church of Philomelium, and to all the Catholick Churches, which are spread through the whole World. Sir, I have transcribed this passage for the sake of the Cardinal's second acceptation of Catholick Church, because I was willing you should know I was not ignorant of it, and because I would save you the labour of making use of it against me by the following considerations. For 1. as it is perfectly new, so the sense of it is unknown to Antiquity, which, as I have shewed from numerous Testimonies, speaks of no Unity of the Catholick Church, under any one Head, but Christ. [St. Augustin your great Latin Father, conformably to those of the Greek Church, speaks of no other Head of the Church, but Christ, not once mentioning the Bishop of Rome as his external Minister, or Vicar over the Universal Church. Pray, Sir, consult him *de Civit. Dei, lib. xxii. cap. 18. Serm. in Evang. Johan. xlv, & xlix, & lxi. De verbis Apost. Serm. xxxiii. Tom. x. Enarrat. in Psalm. xxxvi. concio iii. De decem chordis, cap. 1. But above all others, in Serm. lxi. in Evang. Johan. Princeps hujus mundi jam judicatus est, id est, Diabolus Princeps iniquorum, &c. The Prince of this World is judged, that is, the Devil, the Prince of the ungodly, who live not with their hearts any where but in this World, whereas our Conversation is in Heaven, if we are risen with Christ,*

Wherefore in like manner as Christ is one with us who are his Body; so the Devil is one with all the Ungodly, as with his Body, of which he is the Head. So in Enarrat. Psalm. cxxxix. Sed tamen non propter ista isti cavendi sunt, &c. But of these (Supplanters) heed is not to be taken for those things, but lest they draw thee by their wiles to themselves, that is, divide thee from the Body of Christ, and make thee a member of their own Body. For as Christ is the Head of the Godly, so the Devil is their Head.

These are the two Heads to their respective Bodies, and as you will grant, that the Devil hath no one external ministerial Head under him in his Kingdom upon Earth: So neither, if this comparison be exactly like, hath Christ any such in his. If there were any difference between them in this respect, methinks the Father, when he made this comparison, should have observed it, if he had known it. But his, and all the other Fathers utter silence unto his time of such a ministerial Vicegerent of Christ over his Church, is a just and strong presumption, that they never heard of any such.] On the contrary, according to the Authorities, you have given me occasion to produce out of their Writings, Christ alone is the Head, *in and under* whom the multitude of Churches are *formally* united into one Community, which makes them one Universal Church. He is the Center of Catholick Communion, the true Vine to all the Branches of the Catholick Church, the vital Head, which by the influence of his holy Spirit infuses Unity into the Members of his mystical Body, as it is written, *One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all.* 2dly, I must pray you to observe the inconsistency of the Cardinal with other Writers in

in his
shew t
Catho
Comm
them
Logic
and sp
him,
Army
is th
ricula
tion
tion
Chur
of C
Com
othe
upo
as i
the
Vic
lor
ple
tho
Rom
Soc
ent
of
fid
of
sh
of
U
C
C
ly
w

in his new distinction, which he invented to shew that the Church of *Rome* is the principle of Catholick Unity, and the Center of Ecclesiastical Communion to all other Churches, that forms them into one Body, and by consequence, is, as Logicians observe, like the *last Unit*, which forms and specifies the number; or, as he speaks, like him, that commands in chief over the whole Army makes an Unity in that military Body, and is therefore stiled *General*, tho' he be but a particular Person. But then how doth this new notion of the Cardinal's strictly agree with the notion of other Writers, which makes not the Church, but the Bishop of *Rome*, the principle of Catholick Unity, and center of Ecclesiastical Communion? For the one is a Society, and the other a single Person; and to turn his similitude upon him, they have as different Conceptions, as in an Army, the General's own Regiment, and the General himself, or in an University, the Vice-Chancellor's College, and the Vice-Chancellor himself. If the Pope of *Rome* be the principle of Catholick Unity, then the principle of Catholick Unity is a Person; but if the Church of *Rome* be the principle of it, then it is a whole Society; but be it the one or the other, I must entreat you in the third place before you make use of the Cardinal's notion and distinction, to consider how you will reconcile it to the Writings of St. *Cyprian*, who hath said so many things to shew, that he never thought the Church, or Pope of *Rome* to be the Head, or center of Catholick Unity and Communion, or that the Catholick Church was *causally* so called from the Roman Church. These notions do not agree with his lxi Epistle in the *Oxford* Edition to *Cornelius*, nor with his notion of every Bishop's being accountable

to none but God, for what he acts in his own *District*. That there was but one *Episcopat* in the universal Church, part of which was committed to every Bishop in full, not to mention other things, particularly those which he [and others] wrote to and of the Popes of those times, especially to † *Stephanus*, which you shall have more at large with many other things, to that purpose,

† *Cyprianus Pompeio*. *Nam inter cetera superba, &c.* Among other fierce and impertinent things which contradict one another, and which he wrote with as great ignorance as indiscretion, &c. Afterwards *Cur in tantum Stephani, &c.* Why did the obstinate perverseness of our Brother *Stephan* break out to that degree? *Firmilianus Cypriano*. *Nisi quod nos gratiam referre, &c.* However I am obliged to *Stephan* for this, that his inhumanity was the occasion of my receiving the proof of your Fidelity and Wisdom. But tho' I occasionally received this benefit, and favour by *Stephan*, yet *Stephan* did nothing, that deserves thanks. For tho' *Judas* did so much good in bringing to pass the Redemption of the World by his falseness, and wicked Treachery towards our Saviour, yet no Man ever thought him worthy of thanks. But I pass by the things that *Stephan* hath done, lest by relating his boldness, and insolence, and wicked deeds, I should encrease my Grief—*Atque ego in hac parte juste indignor, &c.* And upon this score I justly resent this so open, and manifest madness of *Stephan*, because he, who so glories of the place of which he is Bishop, and maintains that it is he, who holds the Succession of *Peter*, upon whom the foundations of the Church are placed, may introduce many other (*Petrus*) and erect new Buildings of many Churches, &c.

Certainly those who treated the person, and judgment, and proceedings of Pope *Stephan* with so little respect, never believed him to be the center of Unity, as Successor to St. *Peter*, or universal Bishop, and Head of the Church. And as to *Firmilianus*, to give some account of him: He was Bishop of *Caesarea* in *Cappadocia*. He sat in the first Council of *Antioch*, against *Paulus Samosatenus*. He continued a Catholick to his Death, and after Death was honoured by the whole Church, as a Saint. As *Lombert* in his Preface to his French Translation of St. *Cyprian's* Works observes against *Baronius*, who vainly asserts he made Shipwrack of the Faith,

when

when y
all agre
the Afri
about t
by Euf
Cap. 2
know,
from C
wheth
lick C
Cathol
Cyprian
Comm
the Ca
their I
a meet
Regin
wholl
separa
on Ea
of the
Histo
Lib. v
Censu
vi. C
vi. C
over
gree
nian
Code
Greg
Bishe
swer
fle
tatio

when you please. [Nay, these notions do not at all agree with the History of the Division between the Asiatick Churches, and the Church of *Rome* about the Observation of *Easter*, as it is related by *Eusebius* in his Ecclesiastical History, *Lib. v. Cap. 23, 24.* whither I refer you, and desire to know, when Pope *Victor* cut off those Churches from Communion with him, and his Church, whether thereupon they ceased to be Catholick Churches, or faithful Members of the Holy Catholick Church? The like I may ask of *St. Cyprian*, when cut off by Pope *Stephan* from the Communion of the Roman Church? According to the Cardinal's Notion, Those holy Bishops, and their Flocks were but a *multitude without Unity*, a *meer rout* of Christians, like so many cashier'd Regiments of an Army without a *General*, and wholly cut off, and alienated from Christ, because separated from his Vicegerent, and Vicar upon Earth, and only visible, and ministerial Head of the Church. As little do they agree with his History of the deposition of *Paulus Samosatenus*, *Lib. vii. Cap. 29, 30.* Or with his History of the Censure and Condemnation of *Novatianus*, *Lib. vi. Cap. 43:* They do not agree with the v. and vi. Canons of the Council of *Nice*, and to pass over other Councils, and Fathers, they do not agree with the Inscriptions of the Letters of *Justinian* the Emperor to the Roman Bishops in the *Code*, nor with the Declarations and Invectives of *Gregory the Great*, against the Title of *Universal Bishop*, nor with the behaviour and synodical * Answer of the Brittish Bishops to *Augustin* his Apostle; for they could not be brought by his Exhortations, or Threatnings, or Miracles, as was re-

* *Beda Hist. Eccl. Lib. 2. Cap. 2.*

ported, to take him for their Arch-Bishop; they told him they ought him no Obedience, nor would alter the religious Rites, and Customs of the British Church.] Wherefore, Sir, I must entreaty you when you write next, not to speak of the present Church of Rome (in which I include the Churches in Communion with it) either expressly, or by implication, as the || whole Catholick Church, or the one Holy Catholick Church. I must entreat you not to take that for granted any more, because it was never spoken of as such, when it was a sound and orthodox Church. And now it is so corrupt, that it is not so much as a part of the One Holy Catholick Church, it is a great imposition upon us to imply, or suppose, that it is the whole, and still so to speak, or write without proof, as if it were a common Principle between us, that it was not only a Catholick, but the Catholick Church.

|| *Sed dic clarius cur Catholicæ Romanam addis? Si Romana idem quod Catholica, nugatio est perinde ac si Catholicam Catholicam dicas; si Catholicæ addita Romana distinguit Catholicam, erit & alia Catholica, quæ non Romana, & nostra erit simpliciter Catholica, licet non Romana—quod si Catholicam dicas, quæ est Orthodoxa, quo sensu & Alexandrina a Constantino M. & Civitates Africane multe ab Augustino, & Constantinopolitana, & Antiochena, &c. ab aliis Catholica olim dicta, nos Romanam Antiquam, ut Catholicam sic agnoscimus. Quæ vero nunc est Romana, quia non Orthodoxa, ne sic quidam Catholica. Verbo tibi dico, & vere, Catholica nullo modo est Romana. Tua vero Romana, nec Orthodoxa est, nec Catholica. Sed Commentator hic esse videtur, Videamus vero, quam sis bellus interpres. Ecclesia (inquæ) dicitur Catholica Romana, non illa solum specialis, quæ Romæ est, sed illæ omnes, quæ unitate fidei, & subjectione ad Romanum Pontificem illi sunt conjunctæ. Catholica vero nec sic etiam Romana. Quæ sic Romana est, papisticam dicas non Catholicam. Defensio Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ contra Archiep. Spalatensem Richardi Cracanthorp. cap. 3. p. 16.*

C H A P. X.

I HAVE now, Sir, done with your Reply, but not with you. For, First, In answer to my Letter, in which I told you, I desired to be excused from sending back your Papers, because I might have occasion to produce them; you say *you entred upon this Engagement, upon assurance that you had to do with a Man of Honour, who would not do any thing that would render the Dispute between us of greater noise, than was convenient for your Circumstances.* This you say you were assured of before you began, and this you expect from a Person of my Character. Sir, if by a greater noise, you mean publishing the Dispute between us, I never gave you, or your Profelyte, or any other Person that assurance, nor know I any such reason as you suggest, why you should expect it from me. As for Personal Danger, you are safe, first, because I do not know who, or where you are. But, secondly, if I did, you are safe in my Principles and Temper, who am an old fashion'd Christian, one of that passive Primitive sort, *qui malunt occidi, quam occidere*, that had rather have my own Blood shed in defence of my Religion, than be accessory to shedding of the Blood, or destroying the liberty of any other Man. But if *by convenient for your Circumstances*, you mean the great convenience to your Emissaries of making Profelytes among us as they do, without let, or hindrance, and giving you all the ease and opportunity you can wish for, as much as if you had a Toleration, I hope you do not expect for your convenience in that sense, that I should be silent, and for.

forbear to publish the Dispute between us, unless we had the same liberty of proselyting the People in Popish Countries, that you, notwithstanding the Laws made against you, have, and are like to have in ours. If you would let us with safety teach our Reformed Religion in the Popish Countries, you should teach your Unreformed Doctrines among us, as securely as you pleased; but you are sensible how much, how vastly much we should be gainers, and you losers by that Bargain; and, like the Children of Darkness, you are wiser in your Generation, than to come to such terms. Wherefore, I hope, Sir, the Wisdom of Government, without making more Laws *ad terrorem*, will in time find a way to discourage your Missioners, and make your Mission and Labours of little, or no effect among us; and you ought not to take it ill, or think it contrary to Honour, if I, or any other of my Character, should contribute our Mites of Interest, and endeavour to bring to pass any Project, or Proposal, evidently tending to the Glory of God, the Honour of our Country, the Security of our Church, soft and gentle in it self, harmless to you, as to your Persons and Estates, hurtful to nothing, but the *Popery* of your Religion, and very profitable, and advantageous to the better Defence, more durable Establishment, and constant encrease, and advancement of ours.

Secondly, Sir, in return to your Query, and Challenge, I must again call upon you to tell me, where *the Roman Church*, i. e. the Religion of the present Roman Church was, *for Five, or Six hundred Years after the first Preaching of Christianity?* Shew me Antiquity, Universality, and Succession through those Centuries for your *Trent Doctrines*, or in your own words alter'd,

alter'd, n
any one
ans in th
ligion, a
bound in
arrogate
and of
Church.
you can
so fairly
which y
our Chu
formati
Challen
answer
that y
have,
Popish
jected,
of it,
likewi
do it,
the C
all the
it, fo
done,
Lynd

† I
Devia
of his
demon
licam
millib
alique
dentin
test d

alter'd, name any Bishops, Writers, Churches, nay, any one single Congregation, or Village of Christians in this Period of Time, that professed your Religion, as it differs from ours. I think you are bound in Honour to do it, if you can, because you arrogate to your selves the Title of the Holy, and of the one Holy Catholick, and Apostolical Church. Nay, Honour obliges you to do it, if you can, upon my account; who, I hope, have so fairly answer'd your Query, and Challenge, in which you called upon me to shew you, *where our Church was 900, or 1000 Years before the Reformation.* If you do not answer my Query, and Challenge, as fairly, and particularly, as I have answered yours, you must give us leave to think, that your Silence proceeds from the sense you have, that those Ages afford no Evidence for the Popish part of your Religion, which we have rejected, but only for that ancient and sound part of it, which we have retained. Your interest likewise obliges you to do it, because if you can do it, you'll do all, and put an end for ever to the Controversie, and not only convert us, but all the Protestant World. I say, if you can do it, for I despair of seeing it fairly, and honestly done, as did the learned Gentleman Sir *Humphrey Lynde* cited above, in his † *Dedicatory Epistle to the*

† It is the *Dedicatory Epistle* to his Book, entituled, *Via Devia*, printed at London 1630. So Dr. *Cracanthorp*, in p. 78. of his Book above cited. *Audi enim quod hic constanter dicam. demonstra vel tu, vel quivis ex vestris non dico Ecclesiam Catholicam, sed vel particularem ullam Ecclesiam, etiam ex tot mille millibus Myriadum, qui fidem Christi professi sunt, vel unum aliquem ante sexcentiesimum à Christo annum, qui fidem istam Tridentinam, quam vos Catholicam, extra quam nemo salvari potest dicitis, docuit, tenuit, ac professus est, & herbam dabo: viceris:*

the ingenuous, and moderate Romanists of this Kingdom. In which, being confident it could not be done, he writes thus : *Give me leave therefore by way of Counter-challenge to your Jesuit, to use the words of Soberness, and Truth; Where was your Church, and Trent Doctrine, before Luther? For I call God, and the heavenly Angels to witness, that notwithstanding you obtrude the Invisibilty of our Church, as a Stumbling-block to the Ignorant, and your great brags of an outward face of an eminent and glorious Roman Church; yet your Trent Faith, and Doctrine, was far from the Knowledge of Christ, and his Apostles. Nay more, if any Jesuit, or all the Jesuits alive can prove your Roman Faith had Antiquity, Universality, and Succession in all Ages, and that your Trent Articles were commonly and continually taught, and received de fide, as Articles of Faith before Luther, let all the Anathema's in your Trent Council fall upon my Head.*

Sir, this is the satisfaction we still want, and for which I call upon you so often, desiring you to shew me *Antiquity, Universality, and Succession* for your Additions to the Old Creed; shew me that they were Ancient and Orthodox Doctrines generally received, and revered by Antiquity, as Truths necessarily to be believed in

viceris : Ego me statim antiquitatis fidei vestre praconem libentissime profitebor. So Dr. Montague in his Preface to the *New Gagg* : If any Papist living, or all the Papists living, can prove unto me, that all those Points which the Church of Rome maintaineth against the Church of England, were or was the perpetual Doctrine of the Catholick Church; the concluded Doctrine of the representative Church in any General Council, or National, approved by a General; or, the dogmatical Resolution of any one Father for 500 Years after Christ, I will subscribe

order

order to
by true
the Cou
were c
Princip
are cle
ons from
have fu
Christia
your ne
Explica

You
the an
and M
they g
main t
if you
finitio
and in
cient
encrea
ancien
You h
old F
which
get a
out a
multi
Grain
Tare
Simi
ditio
the c
beg
that

order to Salvation, and were transmitted as such by true Catholick Tradition from Age to Age to the Council of *Trent*. Nay, shew me that they were contained or involved in any of the prime Principles, or Articles of the Christian Faith, and are clearly deduced from them as Conclusions from their Premisses. If you can shew they have such a connexion with the old Articles of Christian Belief, then you will convince me, that your new Additional Doctrines of Faith are only Explications and Definitions of the old.

You know, ‡ *Vincentius Lirinensis* compares the ancient Creed, as to its *Parts*, to the Limbs and Members of a Child's Body, which though they grow and increase to manly Stature, yet remain the same without addition or change. And if you can fairly shew, that your additional Definitions in *Pius IVth's* Creed, are only the growth and increase of the Limbs and Parts of the ancient Creed, then I will confess, that it is only encreased by them, and differs no more from the ancient Creed, than a Man from a Boy or Child. You know he also compares the Articles of the old Faith to Grains of Wheat cast into the Ground, which in process of time grow and encrease, and get a new Form and outward Appearance without any change of their Nature; and though they multiply, yet they multiply in the same Kind of Grain, which are all wholsom Wheat, and not Tares, or poisonous Weeds. According to which Similitude, if you undertake to deduce your additional Doctrines and Definitions from any of the old Principles, or Articles of Faith, I must beg leave to put you in remembrance so to do it, that the deduced Doctrines may appear to retain

‡ *Commonitoril*, cap. 27, 28, 29, 30.

the Nature of the respective old Articles from which you deduce them, and not to be of another Kind. If you can do this, you'll do your Church the best Service that ever Man yet did it, much better than *Bellarmin*, or the Bishop of *Meux* did it, and for your Performance, you'll deserve a Monument of everlasting Honour, both from her, and ours. But if you cannot do this, we must still maintain, That *Pius's* Creed is not *profectus fidei*, but *permutatio*, not an increase, but a change of the old Faith, and new not only in the manner, but matter thereof, quite of another Kind, and different and disagreeing from the old Creed, and what was taught as necessary to Salvation in the ancient Christian Church. In short, if you can do this, we'll embrace the Confession of *Pius IV.* with as much reverence and submission as the *Nicene*, or *Constantinopolitan* Creed, which we know and believe to be only an Enlargement, or increase of the shorter and more ancient Creed, without addition of Parts, or alteration, only containing an Exposition, or Declaration of the same Articles in more words, [according to the * sense of the ancient Church,] and not the least new Matter of Faith. Do but make this appear of *Pius's* Creed, and I am yours, and will reverence the Council of *Trent*, as much as that of the first Council of *Nice*. But till you can do this, till you can make all this appear to me out of the Records of the Church, I must believe and affirm, that you have not declared or defined the old Faith, or any part of it in your Additions, but coined a new one, in

* This is so true, that the word *ὁμοδοξία* was used by the Writers of the Church before the Council of *Nice*.

Matter
declar
of Fai
Script
to the
ampli
upon
which
Apost
Artic
Catho
ved.
is an
ral C
Writ
Strin
diffic
icul
be in
Tru
Artic
diffe
and
each
vela
migh
Cro
rifer
to t
I m
Art
tion

Matter as well as in Form. Nay, though you declare that the Church cannot make an Article of Faith, as she cannot write a *Canonical Book of Scripture*, yet till you can prove your Additions to the old Creed to be nothing else, but a farther amplification and defence thereof, I must look upon them as so many new † *Artus*, or *Membra*, which are not to be found in the Body of the Apostles Creed, that is, as so many new imposed Articles, which with the old, you say is the *true Catholick Faith*, out of which no Man can be saved. And for imposing of which, your Church is answerable to God, and a truly free and general Council, when such an one can be had. Your Writers define an *Article of Faith* to be a Doctrine, which containeth some special reason of difficulty in it self, for which it *requireth a particular and distinct Revelation*, because it cannot be inferred, or deduced out of any other revealed Truth. And one of them gives for Example, the Article of our *Saviour's Resurrection*, which is a different Point of Faith from that of his *Death and Passion*, as this is from that of his *Nativity*; each of which require a distinct, and several Revelation from the other: Because, saith he, Christ might have been born, and not died upon the Cross, and died upon the Cross, and yet not risen the third Day from the Dead. According to this definition and explication of an Article, I must charge your Church with making new Articles of Faith, because so many of her Definitions *de fide*, are so difficult, as to require parti-

† *Parva Lactantium Membra, magna juvenum: eadem ipsa sunt tamen. Quot parvulorum artus, tot virorum.* Vincent. Lirinensis Common. cap. 29.

cular and distinct Revelations, by reason they cannot be inferred, or deduced out of any other Article, or revealed Truth. And therefore your Church teaching Doctrines to be *de fide*, which by reason of the special Difficulties that attend them, require so many particular Revelations, because they cannot be inferred from any revealed Truth, is guilty of forging new Articles, or imposing new Doctrines, as Articles of Faith, (necessary to be taught by all Priests, and believed by all Christian People,) which you neither have deduced, nor can, as I believe, deduce from other *revealed Truths*, and which therefore require so many particular and distinct Revelations, that they may be believed. Many false Teachers and Hereticks of this Age, pretend Revelations for the new Doctrines which they teach, because they know they were never taught before; but your Church takes upon her to teach new Doctrines, and imposes the belief of them upon us, as necessary to Salvation, without any pretences to new Revelations, only by virtue of a pretended, unerring, and infallible Authority, which she arrogates to her self.

But, Sir, it will be your Honour to justify her Claim, and acquit her of this charge of forging new Articles, or novel Doctrines for our Belief, which Antiquity never taught, either as Truths, or Truths necessary to Salvation; and which therefore require, that you should either shew us their connexion with the old in a Chain of true Consequences, or let us know when, and to whom they were revealed, as Parts of the true Catholick Faith, which all Christian Men ought to believe. It will be the best Work of your Life, if you can do it, a Work truly worthy of you, and all your Catholick Doctors, as they

they
great
you
your
other
call
If
of y
that
then
did t
Roma
Apos
this
an F
with
ly;
my F
relie
drea
fall
stand
fions
Scrip
ry, a
neral
bates
whic
cent
ter o
T
shev
have
gene
Wo
able
hat

they are pleased to stile themselves; a Work of greatest moment to the Christian World; and if you think you can do it, I beseech you by all your Christian Charity to do it for my sake, who otherwise am like to die, in what they, and you call Heresie, and Schism.

If I live to see it done by you, or any other of your learned Writers, I will bless the Day that I entered into Controversie with you, and then reverence the present, as much as I ever did the ancient Church of *Rome*, and declare the *Roman Catholick*, and the *one holy Catholick and Apostolick Church* to be same thing. Sir, I make this Declaration to you sincerely upon my Christian Faith, and Honour; for if I am in an Error with the Church of *England*, I am so unwillingly; my Mistake is my Misfortune, more than my Fault, who abhor the direful Nature of Heresie and Schism, of which I have always had dreadful Apprehensions; and that I might never fall into either, I have, to the best of my understanding, always diligently examined the Pretensions of all Churches by the Golden Rule of Scripture, expounded by *Antiquity, Universality, and Consent*. This is the Rule by which General Councils guided themselves in their Debates and Determinations, particularly the Third, which met at *Ephesus* against *Nestorius*, as *Vincentius Lirinensis* shews in the Forty second Chapter of his Book.

To this Rule I resolve to stick, till you can shew me a better; by this Rule in particular, I have tried your Religion with all due care, diligence and attention, both as to its Doctrine, Worship, and Polity, and find it very disagreeable to it in every Point. Which, I must confess, hath hitherto given me such an Idea of your

Church, as I am not forward to express. But whatever apprehensions I may have of it, or aversion to it, I have a peaceable Mind, and perfect Charity and Good will towards Men of all Orders, Ranks and Degrees in it. And I trust in God, that difference in Religion between you and us shall never have any ill influence over my Practice, or tempt me to make any Distinction, as to the performance of relative Duties, between Persons of your Communion, and our own. The Duties of Humanity, and Natural Justice, which are common to us with all Men, are of great and sacred Obligation, not to mention those, with which our common Christianity hath more particularly charged our Consciences, as to our Behaviour, in Charity, Prudence, and Honesty towards all Men, to them we think *without*, as carefully as them *within*, to Unbelievers, as well as Believers, strictly commanding us to give no offence to *Jews*, or *Greeks*, or to those of the Church of God. Sir, with a sense of these unalterable Duties to you, and all others of your Religion, I have hitherto written, and shall proceed to write in the Controversie between us; and however it may determin, I shall continue to be

Your faithful Friend and Servant,

GEO. HICKES.

Some

Some LETTERS, which passed between Dr. Hickes, and his unknown Adversary, from the second to the twenty fourth Day of April 1704, before the Doctor sent the foregoing printed Answer to his Reply.

April the 2d, 1704.

SIR,

SINCE I am apt to be persuaded, that there is a wide difference betwixt the answering of a difficulty propos'd, and the pretending to be able easily to do it, I wish you would take the pains to make me sensible of this mistake, as far as relates to our purpose. And to make an easie matter, yet easier, Let us strip our selves of all superfluous words, digressions, jests, or other artifices of prolonging the Dispute, and shut up our selves to be try'd by the force of our reasons alone: Which if we have the assurance to do, we shall soon see the arms drop out of the hands of one of us. One would think that after having study'd amongst you for this 150 Years and more, you should have an answer ready to this *thread-bare* Question. *By what lineage do you make your descent good from the fourth Century to the pretended*

Reformation?

Reformation? If by the Roman Catholicks, answer the difficulties propos'd. If by any other, who either held the same pretended Errors, or others as ill, answer the same difficulties proportionably. And if you will pretend to draw out the old rusty distinction of *points fundamental*, and *not fundamental*, Pray tell us *First*, what you mean by fundamental, and *2dly*, which points precisely are to be esteem'd fundamental, if you can: And if you cannot, confess that you cannot. If you will proceed in this manner, a few lines may make a full Answer, and a few Days put an end to the Question: If you will not, or will not do it soon, I desire you will send back the Papers to the place from whence you had them, for I am going out of Town very soon.

I am, Sir, tho' unknown,

Your Well-wisher and Servant,

A. B.

April the 5th, 1704.

S I R,

YOUR anonymous Letter, dated the 2d Instant, I received yesterday towards the Evening, when some Gentlemen were with me, who came to make me a charitable Visit, having heard, I was not well. In it you sent me a Question to Answer, which you call a *thread-bare* Question, viz. *By what Linage do you make good your*

your descent from the fourth Century to the pretended Reformation? I suppose by *your descent*, you mean either the descent, or succession of our Doctrines, or the descent, or succession of our Bishops, and Priests, or it may be both, for by the uncertainty of the terms, in which you put your Question, I am left to guess at your meaning. If by *your descent*, you mean the descent of our Doctrines, I answer, that they have descended to us from the end of the fourth Century, as they did from the third Century to the end of the fourth, and from the second to the end of the third, and from the first to the end of the second, from Christ and his Apostles, through a continued Succession of Oriental, and Occidental Churches to the time of the Reformation, only with this difference, that they descended through the first four Centuries pure, and without erroneous additions and mixtures, but afterwards were conveyed down with Errors, and Innovations, at first fewer, and of less moment; then by degrees more, and greater (especially in the Latin Church.) And the Church of *England* by the Reformation separated the pure, and primitive Doctrines, from those impure additions, which were not primitive: She separated the Wheat from the Chaff, the Gold from the Dross, and the Doctrines, I mean the positive Doctrines; which you hold with us, you cannot, you dare not deny to be primitive, and pure. And this Answer, as to substance, hath been made 150 Years ago, and hath never been confuted. But if by *your descent*, you mean the descent, or succession of our Bishops, and Priests, I answer that we have as good a succession of Bishops and Priests, as the Roman Church hath this day, or had at the time of the Reformation. A succession derived thro'

seventeen Centuries from the Apostles, and their next Successors by continued Consecrations, and Ordinations, of which we have most certain Evidence, and Records from the beginning of the Reformation, as hath been often shew'd to the World.

I have now, Sir, sent you an Answer to your Question, or rather Questions; for if by *your descent*, you meant both the descent of our Doctrines, and of our Bishops and Priests, it was *fallacia plurium interrogationum*, and not one Question, but two. But be it as you please, one, or two Questions, as in compliance with your request, I have returned a plain Answer to it: So I hope, in requital, you will be so kind, as to return me as plain an Answer to those which follow in your own terms.

By what Linage do you make good the descent of Transubstantiation, thro' the first five Centuries to the sixth?

By what Linage do you make good the Pope's Supremacy over the Universal Church through the same Centuries?

Shew me the descent of the first Doctrine, if you can, through the first five Centuries against *Albertinus* in his three Books in one Volume, *de Eucharistiae Sacramento*, printed MDCLV.

Shew me, if you can, the descent of the second Doctrine through the same Ages against one of your learned Writers, *Lambert*, in his Preface to the French Translation of *St. Cyprian's Epistles*, and *Launoy*, and others, and one of ours, *Dr. Barrow*, in his Book against the Pope's Supremacy.

If the Linage, or descent of these Doctrines, cannot be proved through those Ages, *i. e.* from Christ and his Apostles to the beginning of the sixth

fixth
to yo
after
a Ch
them
cessa
they
that
I
the
whic
lick.
good
A
to c
men
use
wh
ruff
finc
ons
tim
fa
sen
if
I t
we
for
wh
ve
th
th
yo
th
an
th

sixth Century, it will be no matter of Triumph to your Church to shew their Original many Ages after; nor can any Christian be obliged to be of a Church, which imposes Doctrines under *Anathemas*, as true and catholick Doctrines, and necessarily to be believed in order to Salvation, if they cannot be made good, or authenticated from that descent.

I might ask the same question concerning all the Doctrines in dispute between you and us, which we deny to be Pure, Primitive or Catholick, whose *Linage* it lies upon you to make good through the foresaid Ages.

As to the distinction (which you think decent to call the *old rusty distinction*) of *points fundamental, and not fundamental*, it is you, Sir, to use your own words, *who draw it out*, and not I, who as yet have had no occasion for it. But as rusty, as you are pleased to think it, you may find it polished in Answers to your two Questions, by Mr. *Chillingworth*, to whom in 50 Years time there has been made no substantial, satisfactory Answer.

As to your Papers, which you desire me to send back to the Person, from whom I had them, *if I will not answer them, or answer them soon*, I told Mr. ———n when he brought them, I would, God willing, certainly answer them. He found me removing, when he brought them, which as I remember, was last Wednesday Sevensnight. Last Saturday he came to tell me, that you were speedily to go out of Town, and that you desired a speedy Answer; I reply'd that you pretended so a Month ago, but were here still, that the Controversie was now between you and me without any farther regard to his Sister, that if you went out of Town, my Answer might be

be sent to you in any part of *Europe*; that I was not well; that I had a great deal of other work, the world knew of, upon my hands; that I was an infirm Man (and now I will add an Old Man, who hath no *Amanuensis*) but that by God's assistance I would certainly answer your Papers, and so I now tell you, that I will answer them by God's help, with the first conveniency, and opportunity of Health and Leisure, though you are pleased to intimate in a very plain manner, that I have declined to answer them, because of the difficulties proposed in them. But I assure you, Sir, I do not think it difficult at all to make an answer to them, though to use the words of your Letter, *being full of superfluous words, digressions and artifices to prolong the Dispute*, it will require much labour of writing to answer them, which I, who am attended with so great infirmities of Body cannot easily endure. But in no respect else will it be difficult for me to make an answer to them, and therefore, Sir, I must beg your excuse, that I do not send them back. No, Sir, I'll keep them in memory of you, tho' I know not, who you are. I'll keep them also, because I do not know what occasion I may have to produce them, and for the same reasons, I doubt not but you'll keep mine, and so I wish you to do.

Sir, when you write next, I pray you to write with more care, and perspicuity, and propriety of expression, as becomes a Controversial Writer; and as you are a Divine, I will also beg leave to put you in remembrance, that it becomes you to write with more gravity, and in a more modest stile, and with more respect to
your

your
you a
advice
to my
ner, y
at any
thing
Chara
Censu
Men,
Th
I pre
the
twee
and
Char

your Adversaries, in Controversie with whom you are, or may be engaged. Sir, I offer this advice in general, rather than in particular, as to my self (whom you may treat in any manner, you think fit) that in case your Papers at any time should come to be published, nothing may be found in them unsuitable to those Characters, which may expose you to the just Censure of learned, and sober, and judicious Men, of what Religion soever they be.

These rules of writing Controversie, which I presume to put you in mind of, I shall in the whole progress of what shall pass between us, take care to remember my self, and to shew my self in all Offices of Christian Charity.

Your faithful Friend,

and Servant,

GEO. HICKES.

April

April the 10th.

S I R,

UPON the 8th of this, in the Evening, I receiv'd yours of the 5th, in answer to a few Lines I had writ to you on the 2d, to press you, if I could, to return an Answer to my former Paper, that I might have time to reply to yours, before my departure out of Town. The whole drift of the Letter, and the terms of the Question, to which you have endeavour'd to return an Answer, methinks might have inform'd you, that I had no design to put a new Question to you, to be answer'd separately; but to urge you to return an Answer to the former. In reference to which former Question, the new one was made so short, as compendiating in it the sense of the former Query in other words, and as being there more fully explain'd. For having there formerly ask'd you to shew me the *Protestant Church for 900, or 1000 Years before the pretended Reformation, your Bishops, Congregations, &c.* it seems to follow clearly, (this Question being put in reference to the former,) that when I ask'd you now, *How you make good your Descent for so many Ages*, you ought to understand it of the Succession of your Church, Bishops, Congregations teaching, and believing your Doctrines. So that I neither mean your Doctrine only, nor your Bishops and Priests only; but a Succession of faithful Men, including both Pastors and Flock, such as may be call'd a Church teaching and believing the Articles of the Church of England. And this my meaning I thought I had sufficiently explain'd, in my Answer to your

Exceptions

Except
the Q
the C
enqui
fides
And t
and n
they
forme
in thi
the L
as yo
cause
gation
we sa
As if
of an
a Bla
nerat
more
An
ness,
Que
of y
whic
whic
fivel
Chu
just
F
on o
the
in a
of
per
con
as

Exceptions against my other Query. Besides that, the Question being about the Indefectibility of the Church, it ought to be supposed that we enquire after the perpetuity of that, which both sides grant to be indefectible, to wit, the Church. And this seems to me to be the natural, clear, and necessary sense of my words, especially if they be taken, as they ought, with respect to the former Query. And though the Question taken in this sense, include *Bishops, Priests, People*, and the *Doctrine* they teach and hold, yet it is not, as you say, *Fallacia plurium interrogationum*, because the word Church, or Society, or Congregation, includes only the *Faithful*, *in recto*, (as we say,) and *the Doctrine believ'd*, *in obliquo*. As if I should ask some Jocky, whether he knew of any Breed of Horses, that had been mark'd with a Black-spot in the Face from Generation to Generation for this 300 Years: It would be no more than one Question for the same Reason.

And now, may not one suspect without Rashness, that you artificially mistook the state of the Question, as if I had not demanded a Succession of your Churches, but of some of your Doctrines which are common to both you and us? And which, no doubt, you may easily deduce successively down through the Occidental and Oriental Churches. But this is just nothing, and yet it is just all the Substance of your Answer.

For, 1st. You must shew the successive Tradition of those Doctrines not in our Church, not in the Eastern Church; but in a Protestant Church, in a Church holding the Articles of the Church of *England*: Otherwise you do not prove the perpetual Descent of your Church, but ours. And consequently, your Answer doth not so much as touch my Question.

2^{dly},

2dly, Your Answer is fitted for the defence of all Heresies, as well as your Church. You told us in your last Paper, (and the thing in it self is manifest) that there are several Protestant Churches, that are not true Churches. Now let us apply the words of your Answer to any of them; for Example, the Socinians, Quakers, &c. who hold with us the Unity, and other Attributes of God, the Birth, Passion, Death, and Resurrection of Christ, &c. Now, suppose these false Churches were urg'd with this Argument of the Perpetuity of the true Church, thus they might take up your words, and defend themselves in the same manner that you do: *Our Doctrines have descended to us from the Apostles, through a continued Succession of Oriental and Occidental Churches to the time of our Reformation, only with this difference, that, first, they were deliver'd pure to us, but afterwards mix'd with many Errours, which we separated from the pure and primitive Doctrines; and these Doctrines, I mean the positive Doctrines which you hold with us, you cannot, you dare not deny to be pure and primitive.* Behold your whole Answer in Substance, which you say has been made 150 Years ago, and never yet confuted. And yet it clearly confutes, and destroys it self, as being a Defence for all the Hereticks, that ever went out of the Church, and consequently a false one; for no Truth can give Testimony to Falseness. Therefore you are desir'd to exhibit some other Answer in your defence, except you will be content to stay under the same roof with those, whom you confess to be false Churches.

I have, Sir, many other, as I think, just and important Exceptions against this your Answer: As, 1st, By what Rule you so assuredly know that those Doctrines alone which you have re-

tain'd,

tain'd
Church
no o
2dly,
tolerat
the be
in Vir
the fe
know
better
that is
at the
your f
the wh
Chaff
3dly,
were
were
of a
ons I
But p
partly
to be
occasi
Paper
ent n
more
As
make
and t
Centr
able,
But
again
Sacre
noy,
will

tain'd, are requisite to the Constitution of a Church, wherein Salvation may be had, and that no other Points are necessary to be believ'd? 2^{dly}, How can you escape the censure of an intolerable Presumption for a few Reformers at the beginning, and those not singular, or eminent in Virtue or Learning, to pretend to understand the sense of Scriptures, and Antiquity, and to know the universal Traditions of the Church, better than all the Eastern, and Western Churches, that is, better than the universal Church, at least at the beginning of your Reformation, as you your selves must confess; and in opposition to the whole World, to dare to separate as *Dross* and *Chaff* whatever Articles you thought fit to mislike? 3^{dly}, Supposing the Errors you pretend to spy, were truly so, how can you defend that they were not so grievous, as to destroy the very Being of a true Church? These, and other Exceptions I could justly make against your Defence: But partly because it would draw me too far, partly because I think what I have already said to be sufficient, and partly because we shall have occasion to speak of some of 'em in your other Paper, which you promise; I think it convenient neither to trouble you, nor my self with any more at present.

As to your Request in which you desire me to make good the descent of Transubstantiation, and the Pope's Supremacy through the first five Centuries; if it had been moderate and seasonable, I would willingly have comply'd with it. But since you desire me to make good the first against three Books of *Albertinus De Eucharistiae Sacramento*, and the second against *Lambert, Lauenoy*, and *Dr. Barrow*, and others, I hope you will not take it ill, if I desire to be excus'd from
answering

answering in one Paper so many Volumes of two Subjects so different, especially being nothing (but a hinderance) to our present Controversie. I rather remit you to *Gualterus*, and * *Coccinus*, who (if I remember well, for I have no Library by me,) both of 'em deduce Proofs of both those Verities, through all the Centuries. Tho' it may not be amiss to advertise you by the by, that we are not oblig'd to maintain the Pope's Supremacy, in your terms, over the Universal Church, collectively taken. For though it be much the more common, nay, almost general

* The Title of his Book in Latin, is, *Thesaurus Catholicus*, Col. 1600, of which Dr. *Thomas James* writes thus in his *Mystery of the Indices Expurgatorii*. Lastly, You bring in multitudes of Writers, which have, and do daily witness (as you say) the Truth on your side, to prove your Unity, Universality, and Consent. Whom would it not amaze to see such a cloud of Witnesses, and torrent of Writers, as *Coccinus* the great Book-master doth produce in every Question? But setting aside the *bastardy of the false*, and corruption of the true, your *Indices Expurgatorii*, your Catalogues of Books forbidden, your *see, see* in every Page, which is but a Bug-bear to fray Children withal, you shall see how naked and destitute you are of true Fathers, learned Schoolmen, or modern Writers; and that your *Coccinus* (a Writer so much esteem'd by your younger Divines,) was very much to blame to leave his Religion upon pretence of Authorities, (as *Laurence Trivius* reports in his Preface to his first Tome,) abounding on your side, and scarcely to be found in any Number on ours, as you teach Men to say. Accordingly, Doctor *James* hath shewed almost in every Page of his *bastardy of the false Fathers*, how *Coccinus* urges the Authority of spurious Fathers to prove the Popish Doctrines; particularly under the spurious Treatise of *Linus* Pope of Rome, *Jodocus Coccinus* (saith he) the great Treasurer of such fabulous, erroneous, and counterfeit Stuff, urges the Authority of this Book in his first Tome, for Apparitions of the Dead, and in Tome II. for Peter's Supremacy. Thus much I thought fit to observe of my Adversary's *Coccinus*.

Opinion

Opinion amongst our Divines, yet it is not *de fide*. Now, either you thought this was *de fide* with us, or that it was not. If you thought it was not, it seems incongruous in you to oblige me to defend it: If you thought it was, it was no less improper for you to call those Authors that writ against it, *our Authors*.

And now, Sir, since you say the Controversie is only betwixt you and me, and has no regard to the Person for whose sake it was begun, in the Name of God take all the leisure, and convenience you can desire. For it was purely upon that Person's account, and my own departure out of Town, that I was willing to bring the sooner this Debate to some issue. I have much compassion for your Infirmities, and am very sensible of the trouble it is to you, to write so much without help, by my own experience; and therefore I do not desire you should make your self uneasy in the least, upon that account.

I must confess, that your resolution of retaining my Papers in *memory of me*, and because you may have occasion to produce 'em, as you say, a little surprizes me. I would not have you to think, Sir, that I was any way fond of entering into this engagement, or that I was induc'd to undertake this business without some entreaty, and assurance that I should have to do with a Man of Honour, as I doubt not but I have. Therefore I do not believe that you will do any thing which may render this Affair of greater Noise than is convenient for our Circumstances. This is what was assur'd me before I began, and this is what I expect from a Person of your Character.

You desire me hereafter to write with more *perspicuity and propriety of Expression*; which request of yours is too reasonable to be deny'd,

if the meanness of my Talents, which I willingly acknowledge, would let me comply with it. But really, Sir, I cannot in all the Dictionary find a word that expresses my meaning, better than the word *perish*; nor am I so acute as to spy out any ambiguity in these words *the Church of Christ*, having learn'd out of one of the Creeds that there is but *one Church*: And these and such like are the terms in which you want *perspicuity*, and *propriety* of Expression. Let our Papers decide this matter betwixt us. And now, Sir, with the like freedom, give me leave to tell you what I could desire in you; 1st, that having your Eyes open, you would be pleas'd to make use of 'em, and see; and, 2^{dly}, that you would be pleas'd to enter into the Matter in debate, and not *languish about Questions, and Strifes of Words*: For you know very well, that of above a Sheet and a half which you have writ at twice, there is not above ten lines of an Answer.

As to your last Advice, I leave it to you to consider, whether it had not been as decent to have given it by your example, as in writing; and whether it had not been more modest and just to have given your Advice in such Terms as these: *Let us both hereafter write with more Gravity, and in a more modest Stile*, &c. You may be pleas'd to call to memory, that when I had not yet writ above three lines in a Query, without any Offence given, you thought it modest to tell me, that I talk'd like one that *did not understand Controversie*, like a *new Convert*, like a *Novice*, (that is, like a Fool,) all in one Breath. Tho', I confess, I have writ with less Temper than either my Inclination, or Principles exacted from me, purely lest a good Cause should be overborn by such big words as you made use of; yet

in all my Papers you will not read such words, as those of yours. However, for the future (since you are so well dispos'd,) I am resolv'd you shall never overcome me in Courtesie; nor in any Duties of Christian Charity, by which I may shew you the Esteem I have for a Person of your Worth and Learning; and I am,

S I R,

Your true Well-wisher, and humble Servant,

A. B.

April 24. 1704.

S I R,

TO your complex confus'd Question concerning the Descent of our Church a clear and distinct Answer was made, by distinguishing the different signification of the words, and answering separately to Senses really different; without which no Discourse is intelligible, no Question can be examin'd. 'Tis certain, that two Ideas; and two Facts of different Nature; are neither one, nor of the same Nature; and this is evidently the case before us. Doctrine, and Hierarchy are two distinct Ideas, and the descent or succession of Doctrine as a Fact, different from succession of Bishops, and Churches. The *Greek*

Church has undoubtedly Succession of Bishops, and Churches, but not of Doctrine. The Church of Rome which adher'd to the Antipopes, during the Succession at *Avignon*, retain'd the Doctrine, but had not true Succession, if there is any difference between Popes and Antipopes. Thus these Notions, and Facts are evidently distinct, and therefore it was necessary to distinguish them, to give a clear Answer to the Question propos'd.

You acknowledge you neither mean our Doctrine only, nor our Bishops and Priests only; then you comprehend both in the Question; and if Bishops, and Doctrine are different, the Question is certainly *plurium interrogationum*; and 'tis impossible there should be such a Fallacy, if different Things, or Notions were not comprehended in one single Question. You say the word Church includes only the Faithful in Recto, and the Doctrine believ'd in Obliquo. Whatever these Terms may signifie, the Faithful cannot be considered without Faith, nor consequently without Doctrine; and it seems strange, that in your Reply you say something, which is *just nothing* to the Obliquo; but not one word to the Recto. You object against our Doctrine, but not against our succession of Priests, and Bishops.

You declare, the Question includes Bishops, Priests, People and Doctrine; then 'tis plain, it includes the whole Controversie; for Doctrine, and Communion, and Succession of both, contain all that can be comprehended in it. Thus your single Question is in effect the whole Controversie; and I take the liberty to match it with another. What Proof is there of the Descent of the Romish Church from the Apostles to the present Age? Will not this, as you understand Church, appear to be a complicated Question?

stion? You must shew the Origine of all your Doctrine, that Transubstantiation, Communion in one Kind, Invocation of Saints and Angels, Worship of Images, Prayers in a Tongue unknown, Supremacy of the Pope, and all the other controverted Doctrines defin'd in the Council of *Trent*, were taught by the Apostles; and that they have been always taught and believ'd from that Age to the present, that Popes, Bishops, Priests, particular Churches, and Congregations, have for seventeen Centuries profess'd and practis'd them, and that they were true Popes, Bishops and Priests, notwithstanding your own Doctrines concerning the Nullity of Sacraments.

These general Questions will produce a numerous Off-spring, and every Particular must be fully resolv'd, or else the Proof will be imperfect; so that 'tis evident, that one Question, exactly parallel to yours, does include the whole Controversie: And in fine, one Question may be propos'd (as that of *Pilate*, what is truth,) which will contain all the Questions that ever were, or can be imagin'd: And as to your *Jocky*, you may ask him if you please, whether he cannot distinguish between the Race of his Horses, and their Marks; if he has common sense, he can easily tell you, that the Race of his Horses may be without those Marks, and those Marks without that Race of Horses.

In the next Paragraph, you call distinguishing the Question, *artificially mistaking it*; and then you seem to be angry, and say with convenient Modesty, that *all the Substance of the Answer is just nothing*. 'Twas then a noble atchievement of yours, to make a Reply to *Nothing*; but let this Nothing be examin'd: You meant, it seems, by the Descent of our Church, Succession, 1. Of Do-

Strine, 2. Of Pastors, 3. Of Congregations. It was answer'd, that all our positive Doctrines were descended from the Apostles, and that the Succession of our Bishops, and Priests was derived from them: Nothing was said of Congregations, because it was not necessary, since it was obvious to understand, that our Pastors were never without a Flock, and that if a Succession of Bishops and Priests professing our negative Articles, is not necessary to be shewn, so neither of People or Congregations adhering to them: But tho' it is not necessary, yet for your better satisfaction, even that shall be consider'd also.

As to Doctrine, the Sum of the Answer was, that our positive Doctrines, or all that we believe, has been always believ'd in the Christian Church; this you own to be true, but add, that it is *just nothing*. Is it nothing then that our Faith is Catholick? And why is it nothing? *We must shew the successive Tradition of these Doctrines not in the Romish, not in the Eastern Church, but in a Protestant Church, in a Church holding all the Articles of the Church of England; that is, we must shew our positive Doctrine was believ'd in all the Ages of Christianity, in some particular Church, that has in all those Ages protested against Popery, and that has always held all the negative Articles of the Church of England, which renounce the Errors of Popery: A Demand apparently unreasonable, and contradictory to it self. For it is impossible that Popery could be professed against in all Ages, if it was not always believ'd; or, that the Reformation of Errors should be more ancient, than the Errors reform'd; and it is absurd to demand, whether the Pastors and People of the Church of England protested against Errors before they protested; and fram'd Articles*

to renounce them, before they did renounce them; Yet this is the plain meaning of your Demand; and at this rate, 'tis easie to transubstantiate any thing into *nothing*.

You may please therefore to descend out of the Clouds, and convince us, if you can, by solid Proof, that the Doctrines rejected in the *Articles of the Church of England*, are truly Catholick and Apostolick; and then we will reform our Articles; but if those Doctrines are incapable of such Proof, 'tis certain no Christian was ever oblig'd to believe them; and 'tis to no purpose to ask whether they were disbeliev'd sooner or later, since every Christian discerning their Falshood had at all times a right to renounce them.

The only Reason you give of that unreasonable Demand, to shew that our positive Doctrine was always taught in a Church denying your Errors, is that *otherwise we prove the Descent of your Church, not ours*. To which I answer: 1. That the Descent of our Doctrines is originally from the Scripture and Primitive Church, and that Descent belongs not to your Church, as distinguish'd by your Doctrine from ours. 2. Those Doctrines were convey'd down successively in all Catholick Churches, which proves the Descent of our Church, as to Doctrine, because it contains all that we believe to be essential; but not of yours, because you believe many other Doctrines to be alike essential, and the Descent of a part does not prove the Descent of all your Doctrine. 3. The perpetuity of a particular Church, *Greek or Roman, English or American*, is not necessary to be prov'd. 4. To shew that a particular Church is a true Member of the Catholick, it suffices to shew that it has true Pastors, and all Catholick Doctrines howsoever convey'd. 5. A Church may

be descended from the Apostles, whose negative Doctrines were but of yesterday; therefore they are nothing to the Descent of Churches.

But since you will comprehend Congregations in the Descent of Churches, to prevent all complaint of Tergiversation, I answer directly, that there were not any particular Churches, or Congregations explicitly professing all the Articles of the Church of *England*, before they were fram'd at the Reformation. And if you will make advantage of this Concession against our Church, 'tis necessary, first, to justify your own, and to prove that all the Articles positive, and negative defin'd in the Council of *Trent*, younger than the Reformation, were explicitly taught, and believ'd by Christian Congregations, successively from the time of the Apostles to that Council; for, if any one of those Articles was not perpetually profess'd, then there was not perpetual Succession of all your Doctrine; and because you pretend to be the *Catholick Church*, this Succession should be prov'd to be also *Catholick*. But you may confine your self to prove it in the particular Church of *Rome*, from the time of *St. Peter* to *Pius IV.* by continual explicit Confessions of that Church, or other Proof equivalent. But if this will cost too much labour, why are Questions propos'd which necessarily require it? And, what service is it to Religion, if by Argument you destroy your Church, and ours, and all the Churches of Christendom?

To justify, and preserve our Church, 'tis sufficient to shew, that there was just Cause, and lawful Authority to reform; and if so, the Reformation is justify'd; nor can it be condemn'd, because it began no sooner.

To

To return now to the *Answer*: you object against it, that it is *fitted for the defence of all Heresies*. The Sum of it is this, That our Church holds all Catholick Doctrines, has rejected none, and has a true Succession of Pastors; and that this Answer is fitted to all Heresies, is inconceivable. Hereticks may make use of this Plea, and Murderers may plead not guilty as well as the Innocent, but not with Truth: Nor is it possible, that he who believes all Catholick Doctrine can be a Heretick; nor is any one a Heretick who is ready to believe any Catholick Doctrine, when propos'd sufficiently; nor is a good Answer a bad one, if Hereticks use it without any right to it.

The only Hereticks you mention, are *Socinians*, and *Quakers*, who hold with us the Unity, and other Attributes of God, the Birth, Passion, Death and Resurrection of Christ; in which you are mistaken; for the *Socinians* do not hold God's Omniscience, as to future Contingencies, and the *Quakers* do not believe the truth of the Birth, Death and Resurrection of Christ. But whatever their Errors are, you apply to them this Defence: *Our Doctrines have descended to us from the Apostles, through a continual Succession of Oriental and Occidental Churches, pure for a time, afterward mix'd with Errors, which we separated from the pure, and primitive Doctrines; and these you hold with us, and cannot deny to be pure and primitive*: And then you triumph, and affirm, that this is a Defence for all Hereticks, and consequently a false one; for no Truth can give Testimony to Falshood: But this is just nothing, and yet 'tis just all the Substance of your Answer. For,

I. If the *Socinians*, and *Quakers* do hold all Doctrines, that are pure and primitive, and truly Catholick,

Catholick, then they are no Hereticks; and if they have a true succession of Pastors, then their Churches are truly Catholick also, unless they have made a causeless separation from other Churches. 2. If they do not really hold all Doctrines that are truly Catholick, if they have rejected any such under pretence of Reforming, then they have no right to that Defence; and, 3. If they use a Defence they have no right to, or you use it for them, it does not follow that *Truth gives Testimony to Falshood*, for their Defence is not Truth. 4. Tho' you or others abuse this Defence, yet 'tis a good Defence for our Church, if 'tis true, that she holds all Catholick Doctrines, and has rejected nothing but Errors. Therefore 5. You must prove, if it is possible that the Church of *England* has rejected any one Catholick Doctrine; and 6. There is no Plea whatsoever, which has not been apply'd to the defence of Errors: As for instance, Scripture, by the *Manichees*; Inspiration, by the *Montanists*; Tradition, by the *Millenaries*; Succession of Doctrine, and Churches, by the *Greeks*; General Councils, by the *Arians*; and in fine, the Infallibility of Popes and Councils, for the damnable Doctrine of deposing Princes; and therefore if you will go about to justify your Faith, you must neither make use of Scripture, nor divine Inspiration, nor Tradition, nor Succession, nor of the Authority of Popes and Councils, nor yet farther of *your Reason*, for every one of these has been the defense of Hereticks, and Schismatics, and consequently a false one; for no Truth can give Testimony to Falshood. If you say, Those Defences have been falsly apply'd, so say we of your Defence of Quakers, and Socinians.

You

You pretend you have *other just, and important exceptions against the Answer*; three are offered, and more are kept *in petto*, which, when they are known, will be also consider'd.

To the first Exception or Question I answer, That we are sure our Church has retain'd all things necessary to Salvation, because it has retain'd the Scripture, the ancient Creeds, and whatever was thought necessary to the Constitution of a Church in primitive Christianity; and we are sure no other points are necessary, because it is impossible to prove them to be so.

To your second complicated Question I answer separately, That there is no possibility of escaping the Censure of Parties. That 'tis no presumption if *Athanasius* is *contra Mundum*, That the Reformers were as eminent for Virtue and Learning as any of that Age. They agreed with all the Eastern Churches in rejecting the Pope's Supremacy, which is the fundamental point of Popery, as one Communion. That neither the Eastern nor Western Church was infallible. That where-ever the Reformers found Errors, they had a right to reject them. That the *English* Reformers were as capable of understanding Scripture, Antiquity and Tradition, as Pope *Paul III.* or any Council of *Italian* Prelates, tho' joyn'd with a few *French* and *Spaniards*. When the Controversie is examin'd impartially it will appear, they understood them better, Their Judgment was, and is approved by Millions of Christians. Lastly, When they separated the Dross, and Chaff they had reason to do it, and it is not true, that the whole World did oppose them.

To the third Question, supposing the Errors, we pretend to spy, were truly so, how we can defend,

defend, that they were not so grievous as to destroy the very Being of a true Church. I answer in short, that we can prove it by the same way of reasoning, as you can prove, that the Corruptions, and Depravations of a religious Order, when very grievous, do not destroy the Being of the Order, tho' they require a reformation of it; we can also prove it by the same way, that we can prove the Errors, and Corruptions of the Church of *Israel*, which were very grievous, not to have destroyed the Being thereof. This hath often been proved, and the proof of it will be undertaken for your sake in the reply to the answer you expect.

Having perused your Papers, I find nothing in them but general *Cavils*, *Objections* and *Questions*, which have been answered a thousand times, you propose and repeat them without adding any new force, and take no notice of the answers; at this rate the Controversy will be endless, and when we have gone over all the Arguments, Answers, Replys and Rejoinders, that have been made since the beginning of this Controversie, it will be just as it was, and all the common places will be exhausted, without advancing one step towards the finishing of it. If you have any new demonstrative proof for any point of your Religion, 'tis worth while to produce it, for it may convert the Nation; but as to the old Arguments in print, there are Answers in print, and it will be lost labour to transcribe them: But to lessen our labour, if you will produce any one single Argument, be it old or new, for Transubstantiation, I will propose another against it, and so let the strength of them be try'd by a full Examination.

The proof of that point, and of the Pope's
Supre-

Supre
are el
stanti
your
stian
prem
and
of tw
of th
succe
nega
were
am
rus,
beca
swer
unar
inclu
pres
obli
all y
that
Wo
Y
Tha
Sup
tak
lect
tha
tho
Ho
wil
cils
per
has
Æ
can

Supremacy was required of you, because they are essential points in your Religion. Transubstantiation is the foundation of your Mass, and your Church is distinguish'd from all other Christian Churches by adherence to the Pope, as supreme Head of it. And it was surely moderate and reasonable to desire proof of the succession of two Doctrines, from one, who demands proof of the descent of our Church, including therein succession of Pastors, Congregations, and all our negative, as well as positive Doctrines. You were referr'd to *Albertinus* and *Barrow* (who, I am sure, wrote since *Coccius*, and *Gualterus*, though I never saw this latter Writer) because it was thought possible for you to answer them, but because we think them to be unanswerable: And if succession of Churches, including all Doctrines, is the subject of your *present Controversie*, then 'tis evident you are oblig'd to make good the perpetual succession of all your own Doctrines, and especially of those, that do principally constitute your Church and Worship.

You add an Advertisement very unnecessary, That you are not oblig'd to maintain the Pope's Supremacy *over the Universal Church collectively taken*. Your distinction between the Church collective, and diffusive was sufficiently known, and that many of your Doctors deny the Pope's Authority to be superiour to a General Council. However in requital, I will advertise you likewise of what you know already, that the Councils of *Constance*, and *Basil* have defin'd the superiority of Councils; that the *Gallican Church* has constantly maintain'd it; and that apparently *Aneas Sylvius* gave the true reason, why it became *the more common Opinion*, that the Pope is
above

above a Council, which was because Popes did give Bishopricks, and Archbishopricks, but Councils gave none; and therefore 'tis no wonder, if it is true as you say, that this Opinion is almost General amongst your Divines; yet you add, that it is not *de fide*. You know however, that both Opinions have been taught to be *de fide*, and that by great Authorities; and this is true also as to the Pope's Authority of deposing Princes, one Party has affirm'd it to be *de fide*, and the other has deny'd it; and this seems to be an evident proof that Infallibility does not make you agree in what is infallibly defin'd or not. That you are uncertain in points fundamental to Church, and Civil Government, that you have no certain Rule to know what is *de fide*; and that 'tis as hard for you, as for Protestants to define what is fundamental, or to determine the number of all your Articles of Faith, whether written Verities, or unwritten Traditions, or Church Definitions. And of this Uncertainty we have had lately a singular instance at Rome, where your infallible Judge resides, if there is any such thing at present. The Jesuits of China were accused of Idolatry for their prostrations before the Picture, or Statue of *Confusius*. The Fact was certain, the Dispute was, whether it was Idolatry; and that if any thing might be easily determin'd by Infallibility? But the Infallible Judge refer'd it to a Congregation of Cardinals, and there the process depended a long while, and I know not yet whether it is finally decided.

The Writings of Lombert and Launoy being cited against the Popes Supremacy: You ask whether it was thought to be *de fide* or not? Now if his Supremacy over the Church collective, which is but a part of the Church, is not *de fide*,
I de-

I del
over
But
mac
ged
is al
be d
Auth
were
Com
thor
gain
ber
and
ded
urge
I wi
Eraj
Non
affir
Aut
ad C
I
in y
and
may
S
brou
Fam
cont
had
not
reas
a vi
my
perf

I desire to know if it is *de fide* that he is Supreme over the whole Church, or the Church diffusive? But agree that among your selves. If his Supremacy is not *de fide*, 'tis certain *you are not obliged to defend it*, nor any one to believe it, which is all that we desire: And if it was thought to be *de fide*, then say you *it was improper, to call Authors that writ against it your Authors*. They were yours, because they lived and dyed in your Communion, and if you will deny all those Authors to be yours, who have wrote any thing against any part of your Doctrine, then the number of your Authors will be much diminished; and if you will disown them all, content, provided you will consider their Arguments, and never urge the Testimony of any Authors against us. I will add however the ingenuous Confession of *Erasmus*, and you may disown him likewise. *Non desunt Magni Theologi, qui non verentur affirmare, nihil esse in Luthero, quin per probatos Autores defendi possit.* *Erasmi. Ep. lib. 15. Ep. ad Godeschalcum*, if I remember right.

I have omitted nothing that seem'd material in your Letter, if you *languish about Questions and strifes of words* 'tis your own fault, and you may avoid it by producing Arguments.

Sir, When your Letter of the 10th instant was brought to me, the nearest Relation I had in my Family was very sick, and full of Pains, and still continues bedrid. The care, and compassion I had for a Person so near, and dear to me, would not permit me to write an answer; for which reason I desired a Friend, that came to make me a visit, to draw up this, which I send you, as my own. He hath not meddled with any thing personal in your Letter, because he thought not the

the merits of the Controversie concerned in it. But perhaps I may think my self oblig'd to take some notice of it in my Answer to your Reply, which I am sorry, for want of leisure is still owing to you. But I hope in a little time to send it. In the interim I must beg your forbearance, and remain, Sir,

Your faithful Friend,

and Servant,

GEO. HICKES.

FINIS.

T H E
C O R R U P T I O N S
Of the
Church of *R O M E*,
In relation to
Ecclesiastical Government,
T H E
R U L E of FAITH, and FORM of
D I V I N E W O R S H I P.
I N
A N S W E R
To the
Bishop of *M E A U X*'s
Q U E R I E S,
B Y
The Reverend Dr. *B U L L*.

L O N D O N:
Printed for RICHARD SARE. 1705.

THE
CORRUPTIONS
OF THE
Church of ROME

in Relation to
Ecclesiastical Government

THE
TITLE OF FAITH, AND FORM OF
DIVINE WORSHIP

A NEW

By the
Bishop of MEAUX

QUELLES

The Reverend Dr. BULL

LONDON

Printed for RICHARD BARNARD

J
passé
lus,
Je v
beau
vost
de v
steu
de v

A LETTER of Monsieur de Meaux's to Robert Nelson, Esq; upon his having read Dr. Bull's Book, entituled [*Judicium Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Trium Primorum Seculorum de necessitate credendi, quod Dominus noster Jesus Christus, sit verus Deus.*] *presented to him by that worthy Gentleman.*

A Monsieur Monsieur Nelson, a Blackheath.

+

A St. Germain en Laye, 24 Juil. 1700.

J'AY receu, Monsieur, depuis quinze jours une Lettre, dont vous m'honorez de *Blackheath* auprès de *Londres*, le 18 *Juillet* de l'année passée en m'envoyant un Livre du Docteur *Bullus*, entitulé, *Judicium Ecclesiæ Catholicæ*, &c. Je vous dirai d'abord, Monsieur que je ressentis beaucoup de joie à la venüe de vostre écriture & de vostre nom, & que je fus ravi de cette marque de vostre souvenir. Quant à l'Ouvrage du Docteur *Bullus*, j'ay voulu le lire entier, avant que de vous en accuser la reception ; afin de vous en

dire mon sentiment. Il est admirable & la maniere qu'il traite ne pouvoit estre expliquée plus savoramment & plus a fond. C'est ce que je vous supplie de vouloir bien luy faire savor & en mesme temps les sinceres congratulations de tout le Clergé de *France* assemblé en cette ville, pour le service qu'il rend a l'Eglise Catholique en defendant si bien le jugement qu'elle a porté sur la necessité de croire la divinité du Fils de Dieu. Qu'il me soit permis de luy dire qu'il me reste un seul sujet d'etonnement : C'est qu'un si grand homme qui parle si bien de l'Eglise, du Salut que l'on ne trouve qu'en son unité, & de l'assistance infallible du St. Esprit dans le Concile de *Nicée*, ce qui induit la mesme grace pour tous les autres assemblez dans la mesme Eglise, puisse demeurer un seul moment sans la reconnoistre. Ou bien, Monsieur, qu'il daigne me dire comme a un zelé defenseur de la Doctrine qu'il enseigne, ce que c'est donc qu'il entend par ce mot *Eglise Catholique* ? Estce l'Eglise *Romaine*, & celles qui luy adherent ? Estce l'Eglise *Anglicane* ? Estce un amas confus de Societez separées les unes des autres ? Et comment peuvent-elles estre ce Royaume de J. C. non divisé en luy mesme & qui aussi ne doit jamais perir ? Que je serai consolé d'avoir sur ce sujet un mot de responce, qui m'explique le sentiment d'un si grave Auteur. Je suis tres aise Monsieur d'attendre dans vostre Lettre l'heureuses nouvelles de la santé de Madame vostre Femme que je recommande de bon cœur à Dieu avec vous & vostre Famille. Ceux qui vous ont raconté les rares talens de M. l'Archevesque de *Paris* aujourd'huy le Cardinal de *Noailles*, vous ont dit la verité, il y a long temps que la chaire de St. *Denis* n'a esté si dignement remplie. Si M. *Collier* dont vous me parlez a fait

fa
ru
fin
c

I
Lo
wh
Bo
I m
you
Joy
test
per

fait quelque écrit Latin sur la nouvelle Spiritualité vous m'obligerez de me l'envoyer. Mais sur tout n'oubliez jamais que je suis avec beaucoup de sincérité

Monsieur,

Vostre tres-humble, &

tres-obeissant Serviteur,

+ J. Benigne, E. de Meaux.

To Mr. Nelson at Blackheath.

+
St. Germaine en Laye, 24 July, 1700.

I Received, Sir, about a fortnight ago the honour of your Letter from *Blackheath* near London, dated the 18th of July of the last Year, when at the same time you sent me Dr. Bull's Book entituled, *Judicium Ecclesie Catholicae*, &c. I must first, Sir, acquaint you, that the sight of your Hand and Name gave me a great deal of Joy, and that I was extremely pleased with this testimony of your remembrance. As to Dr. Bull's performance, I was willing to read it all over,

before I acknowledged the receipt of it, that I might be able to give you my sense of it. 'Tis admirable, and the matter he treats could not be explained with greater Learning and greater Judgment. This is what I desire you would be pleased to acquaint him with, and at the same time with the unfeigned Congratulations of all the Clergy of *France*, assembled in this place, for the Service he does the Catholick Church in so well defending her determination of the necessity of believing the Divinity of the Son of God. Give me leave to acquaint him, there is one thing I wonder at, which is, that so great a Man, who speaks so advantageously of the Church, of Salvation which is obtain'd only in Unity with her, and of the infallible assistance of the Holy Ghost in the Council of *Nice*; which infers the same assistance for all others assembled in the same Church, can continue a moment without acknowledging her. Or either, Sir; let him vouchsafe to tell me who am a zealous defender of the Doctrine he teaches, what it is he means by the term *Catholick Church*? Is it the Church of *Rome*, and those that adhere to her? Is it the Church of *England*? Is it a confus'd heap of Societies separated the one from the other? And how can they be that Kingdom of Christ not divided against it self, and which never shall perish? It would be a great satisfaction to me to receive some answer upon this Subject, that might explain the Opinion of so weighty and solid an Author. I very much rejoice at the good News you send me of your Lady's welfare, whom I heartily pray for, with you and your Family. You have been rightly inform'd in

in the account you have receiv'd of the admirable Qualifications of the *Arch-Bishop of Paris*, now *Cardinal de Noailles*, the See of *St. Denis* has not for a long time been so worthily filled. If *Mr. Collier* whom you mention has writ any thing in *Latin* concerning the *modern mystical Divinity*, you will oblige me in conveying it to me. But above all remember, that I am with a great deal of sincerity,

S I R,

Your most humble, and
most obedient Servant,

J. Benigne, Bishop of Meaux.

Q 4

Dr.

Dr. BULL's Answer.

SECT. I. **T**HE approbation of my Writings by so learned and illustrious a Prelate as Monsieur de Meaux, especially when join'd with the Congratulations of the learned Clergy of France in general, is so high an Honour done me, that if I did not set a great value on it, I were altogether unworthy of it.

But as to the Wonder of Monsieur de Meaux, I cannot but very much wonder at it, especially at the Reasons on which it is grounded. He wonders how I that speak so advantageously of the Church, &c. can continue a moment without acknowledging her. Her! What her doth the Bishop mean? Doubtless the present Church of Rome, in the Communion whereof he himself lives, and to which his design seems to be to invite me. But where do I speak so advantageously of the present Church of Rome? No where, I am sure. My thoughts concerning her, I have plainly (perhaps too plainly and bluntly in the Opinion of Monsieur de Meaux,) deliver'd in the Book which he so commends, *Jud. Eccl. Cathol.*, cap. 5. §. 3. where having spoken of that singular Purity of the Faith, which was in the Church of Rome in the first Ages, and taken notice of, and extolled by some of the
Primitive

Primitive Fathers, I thus conclude, * " Oh that
 " so great a Happiness, such Purity of Faith had
 " always continued in that Church ! But, alas !
 " we may now cry out in the holy Prophet's
 " words, *How is the faithful City become an Har-*
 " *lot ?*

But Monsieur *de Meaux* seems to think the Roman and the Catholick Church to be convertible Terms, which is strange in so learned a Man, especially at this time of the day. Cannot the Catholick Church be mention'd, but presently the Roman Church must be understood ? The Book which the Bishop refers to, bears this Title, *Judicium Ecclesie Catholice trium primorum seculorum, &c.* Of the Catholick Church of the three first Centuries, I do indeed speak with great deference. To her Judgment (next to the Holy Scriptures,) I appeal against the oppugners of our Lord's Divinity, at this day, whether *Arians* or *Socinians*. The Rule of Faith, the Symbols or Creeds, the Profession whereof was in those Ages the condition of Communion with the Catholick Church, (mention'd by *Irenaeus*, *Tertullian*, and others,) I heartily and firmly believe. This *Primitive Catholick Church*, as to her Government and Discipline, her Doctrines of Faith, and her Worship of God, I think ought to be the Standard, by which we are to judge of the Orthodoxy and Purity of all other succeeding Churches, according to that excellent Rule of

* *Utinam hac felicitas, hac fidei puritas Ecclesia ista perpetua fuisset ! Sed pro dolor ! Nunc propheta divini verbis exclamare possumus, (Isa. i. & 21.) Quomodo effecta est meretrix Urbs fidelis ?*

Tertullian de Prescript. adv. Hæres. cap. xx, xxi.
 “ * Every Descent must necessarily deduce it self
 “ from its first Original. If these things are true,
 “ it is plain that every Doctrine which these Apo-
 “ stolical, these Original and Mother-Churches
 “ held as analogous to the Rule of Faith, is to
 “ be owned as true, and as containing without
 “ doubt what the Churches received from the
 “ Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, Christ from
 “ God; but that all other Doctrine is to be look-
 “ ed upon as false, and no ways favouring of
 “ those Truths which have been delivered by
 “ the Churches, and the Apostles, and Christ,
 “ and God. And to the same purpose he dis-
 courseth, *cap. 31. ejusdem Libri.*

According to this Rule, the Church of England will be found the best and purest Church at this day in the Christian World. Upon which account, I bless God that I was born, baptized and bred up in her Communion; wherein I firmly resolve by his Grace to persist, *usque ad extremum vitæ spiritum.* How far the present Church of Rome hath departed from this Primitive Pattern, will appear hereafter.

Monfieur de Meaux adds as a farther Reason of his Wonder, *that I speak of Salvation as only to be found in unity with her.* Her! Doth the Bishop here again mean the present Church of Rome? If he doth, I must plainly tell him, that

* *Omne genus ad originem suam censeatur necesse est. Si hæc vera sunt, constat proinde omnem Doctrinam quæ cum illis Ecclesiis Apostolicis, matricibus, & originalibus fidei conspiret, veritati deputandam, id sine dubio tenentem, quod Ecclesiæ ab Apostolis, Apostoli à Christo, Christus à Deo suscepit: Reliquam vero omnem Doctrinam de mendacio præjudicandam, quæ sapiat contra veritatem Ecclesiarum, & Apostolorum, & Christi, & Dei.*

I am

I am
only
contr
of the
that i
join i
give
indee
Eye u
of Fa
who
fed,
in his
Cath
way
sent C

TI
infal
cil of
all
whic
Opin
anoth
to th
Artic
of m
worc
“ C
“ fe

*
binun
oi f
7 a
vay
rudes
tos,

I am so far from ever thinking, that Salvation is only to be found in unity with her, that on the contrary I verily believe they are in great danger of their Salvation, who live in her Communion, that is, who own her erroneous Doctrines, and join in her corrupt Worship, of which I shall give a large account before I have done. I do indeed in the Book, which the Bishop hath an Eye unto, shew, that there was a Canon or Rule of Faith received in the Primitive Church, which whoever in any Point thereof denied or opposed, was judged an Heretick, and if he persisted in his Heresie, cast out of the Communion of the Catholick Church, and so out of the ordinary way of Salvation. But what is this to the present Church of Rome and her Communion?

The Bishop's last Reason is, *that I own the infallible Assistance of the Holy Ghost in the Council of Nice, which infers the same Assistance for all others assembled in the same Church.* To which I answer; I mention this indeed as the Opinion of *Socrates*, but at the same time, I give another account of the Credit that is to be given to the determination of the *Nicene Council* in the Article of our Saviour's Divinity, in the *Proemium* of my *Defensio Fidei Nicenæ*, §. 3. where my words are these: * "But the same *Socrates*, Chap. ix. of the same Book, reproves *Sabinus* "for not considering with himself, that they who came

* *Idem* verò *Socrates* ejusdem Libri, Cap. ix. reprehendit *Sabinum* quòd non etiam secum reputaverit, Ὡς εἰ καὶ ἰδὼν ἦν οἱ τὸ συμβόλῃ, καὶ ἡ ἀμύνη τοῦ ἵεροῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τὸ χρεῖστον αἰγίον ἀνδραγαθὸν ἐδάμωσεν ἀποχρῆσαι τὴν ἀληθείαν ἐδύναστο· i. e. Eos qui ad Synodum illam convenerant, quamvis rudes essent & imperiti, à Deo verò & Spiritus S. gratiâ illustratos, nullatenus à veritate aberrare potuisse. Quippe sensisse videtur

" came to this Council, how illiterate soever
 " they were, yet being enlightened by God, and
 " the Grace of the Holy Ghost, could in no wise
 " depart from the Truth. For he seems to have
 " thought the enlightening Grace of the Holy
 " Ghost always to accompany a General Council
 " of Bishops, and to preserve them from Error,
 " especially in any of the necessary Articles of
 " Faith. Which Supposition, if any one shall
 " refuse to admit of, *Socrates's* Argumenta-
 " tion may be thus directed and urged against
 " him: The *Nicene* Fathers, let any imagine
 " them as unskilful and illiterate as he will, yet
 " in the main, were doubtless pious Men: But
 " it is incredible that so many holy and approved
 " Men, assembled from all Parts of the Christian
 " World, (who, how defective soever in any
 " other sort of Knowledge, could by no means
 " be ignorant of the first and fundamental Do-
 " ctrine of the Holy Trinity, a Doctrine wherein
 " the very *Catechumens* were not uninstructed, or
 " of what themselves had received from their
 " Predecessors concerning it,) should wickedly
 " conspire amongst themselves, to new model the

detur Socrates, Concilio Episcoporum verè universali semper adesse
 Spiritus Sancti, gratiam illuminatricem, qua ipsos ab errore,
 saltem in necessariis fidei Articulis, liberos custodiat. Quam hy-
 pothesin si quis nolit admittere, poterit ad ipsum argumentatio
 Socratis ita institui & formari: Patres Nicani ut imperiti &
 literarum rudes fuisse fingantur, pii tamen certè maximam partem
 fuere; incredibile autem est tot viros sanctos & probatos, ex
 omnibus orbis Christiani regionibus convenientes (qui qualicumque
 aliàs imperitià laboraverint, certè ignorare non poterant elemen-
 tariam de SS. Trinitate Doctrinam, etiam Catechumenis tradi
 solitam, aut quid ipsi eà de re à majoribus accepissent,) nefariè
 conspirare potuisse ad hoc, ut receptam in Ecclesià fidem de pri-
 mario Christianismi Articulo, innovarent.

" Faith,

" Faith
 " prin
 these
 moral
 have
 before
 I have
 Judgm
 Bu
 conce
 Ghost
 matte
 the C
 now
 cil:
 face,
 " ca
 " of
 I
 me
 swer
 in th
 alrea
 suffi
 by t
 it is
 mea
 of a
 reta
 Sain
 Sub
 wa
 fir

“ Faith received in the Church, concerning this
 “ principal Article of Christianity. And indeed, all
 these things considered and laid together, it was
 morally impossible that the *Nicene* Fathers should
 have erred, in the Determination of the Article
 before them. And that they did not actually err,
 I have sufficiently proved in the Bishop's own
 Judgment, in the following Treatise.

But suppose I were fully of *Socrates's* Opinion,
 concerning the infallible Assistance of the Holy
 Ghost attending every truly General Council in
 matters of Faith, I should be never the nearer to
 the Communion of the Church of Rome, as it is
 now subjected to the Decrees of the *Trent-Council*:
 For as I afterwards add in the same Pre-
 face, §. 8. † “ The Assembly at *Trent* is to be
 “ called by any other Name, rather than that of
 “ of a General Council.

I proceed to the Bishop's Questions: He asks
 me *what I mean by the Catholick Church?* I an-
 swer: What I mean by the *Catholick Church*
 in the Book, which he all along refers to, I have
 already shewn, and the very Title of the Book
 sufficiently declares. If he asks me, what I mean
 by the *Catholick Church*, speaking of it as now
 it is? I answer; By the *Catholick Church*, I
 mean the Church Universal, being a Collection
 of all the Churches throughout the World, who
 retain * *the Faith* (*ἀπαξ*) *once delivered to the*
Saints; that is, who hold and profess in the
 Substance of it, that Faith and Religion which
 was delivered by the Apostles of Christ to the
 first original Churches, according to *Tertullian's*

† *Tridentina Conventio quidvis potius quam Generale Conci-
 lium dicenda est.* * *Jude iii.*

Rule before-mention'd. Which Faith and Religion is contain'd in the Holy Scriptures, especially of the New Testament, and the main Fundamentals of it compriz'd in the Canon or Rule of Faith, universally received throughout the Primitive Churches, and the Profession thereof acknowledged to be a sufficient *tessera* or *badge* of a Catholick Christian. All the Churches at this day which hold and profess this Faith, and Religion, however distant in place, or distinguish'd by different Rites and Ceremonies, yea, or divided in some extra-fundamental Points of Doctrine, yet agreeing in the Essentials of the Christian Religion, make up together one Christian Catholick Church under the Lord Christ, the supreme Head thereof. The Catholick Church under this Notion, is not a *confused heap of Societies separated one from another*. But it seems, no other Union of the Church will satisfie the Bishop, but a Union of all the Churches of Christ throughout the World, under one visible Head, having a Jurisdiction over them all, and that Head the *Bishop of Rome* for the time being. But such a Union as this was never dream'd of amongst Christians for at least the first Six hundred Years, as shall be shewn in its due place.

The Catholick Church, I believe, shall never totally fail, that is, Christianity shall never utterly perish from the Face of the Earth, but there shall be some to maintain and uphold it to the end of the World. Although some of the ancient Doctors of the Church have given us a very tragical Description of the state of the Universal Church of Christ, which shall be under the Reign of the great *Antichrist*. But I know of no Promise of Indefectibility from the Faith made to any particular Church, no, not to the Church
of

of Rome
Holy
Aice
sent
fail'd
Errors
Church
may
in one
ment
Faith
that
man
calyp
the S
Church
Bu
ask
mean
land
one
of R
Gree
of w
tholi
furd
to be
be th
Chu
that
Rome
to re
Chu
learn
ry e

of *Rome* it self. And if we may judge by the Holy Scriptures, and by the Doctrine and Practice of the Primitive Catholick Church, the present *Church* of *Rome* hath already lamentably fail'd, and fallen into many dangerous and gross Errors, as will by and by appear. Now that Church which hath already so far fail'd, why may she not utterly fail? If she be found but in one Error, the infallible direction of her Judgment, upon which her Indefectibility from the Faith must depend, is gone, and destroy'd. I add, that divers eminent * Doctors, even of the Roman Communion, have discover'd out of the *Apocalyps*, that *Rome* it self shall at length become the Seat of Antichrist. If so, where will the *Church* of *Rome* then be?

But I wonder why Monsieur *de Meaux* should ask me, whether by the Catholick Church, I mean the *Church* of *Rome* or the *Church* of *England*? He knows full well, I mean neither the one nor the other. For to say either of the *Church* of *Rome*, or of the *Church* of *England*, or of the *Greek Church*, or of any other particular *Church* of what denomination soever, that it is the Catholick or Universal Church, would be as absurd, as to affirm that a part is the whole. And to be sure I never meant the *Church* of *Rome* to be the Catholick Church exclusively to all other Churches. I am so far from any such meaning, that my constant Judgment of the *Church* of *Rome* hath been, that if she may be allowed still to remain a *Part*, or *Member* of the Catholick Church, (which hath been questioned by some learned Men, upon Grounds and Reasons not very easie to be answer'd,) yet she is certainly a

* *Ribera & Viega in Apoc. xvii.*

very unsound and corrupted one, and sadly degenerated from her Primitive Purity. This I must insist upon, and have obliged my self to prove; and I prove it thus:

Sect. II. The Church of Rome hath quite altered the *Primitive Ecclesiastical Government*, changed the *Primitive Canon* or *Rule of Faith*, and miserably corrupted the *Primitive Liturgy* or *Form of Divine Worship*.

1st, She hath quite altered the *Primitive Ecclesiastical Government*, by erecting a Monarchy in the Church, and setting up her Bishop, as the universal Pastor and Governour of the whole Catholick Church, and making all other Bishops to be but his Vicars and Substitutes, as to their Jurisdiction.

For that the Bishop of Rome had no such universal Jurisdiction in the Primitive Times, is most evident from the sixth Canon of the first *Nicene Council*, occasioned, as it appears, by the Schism of *Meletius*, an ambitious Bishop in *Egypt*, who took upon him to ordain Bishops there, without the consent of the Metropolitan Bishop of *Alexandria*. The words of the Canon are these: [† *Let the ancient Customs prevail, that are in Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, That the Bishop of Alexandria have the Power over them all, for as much as the Bishop of Rome also hath the like custom. In like manner, in Antioch, and all other Provinces, let the Privileges be preserved to the Churches.*] From this Canon it is plain, that the three Metropolitan Bishops, or *Primates*, (they were not as yet, I think, call'd *Patriarchs*)

† Τα ἀρχαία ἐν ἡμετέροις.
Ephesin. Can. 8.

Vid. Apost. 34. & Conc.

of *Alexandria*, *Rome* and *Antioch*, had their distinct Jurisdictions, each independent on the other; and that all other chief Bishops or Primates of Provinces, had the same Privileges which are here confirm'd to them. It is true, this Canon doth not particularly describe or determine what the Bounds are of the *Roman* Bishop's Power, as neither doth it the Limits of the Bishop of *Antioch*'s Jurisdiction, but only those of the Bishop of *Alexandria*'s Province. The reason hereof is manifest, the case of the Bishop of *Alexandria* only was at this time laid before the Synod, whose Jurisdiction in *Egypt* had been lately invaded by the schismatical Ordinations of *Meletius*, as I before observ'd. But that the *Roman* Bishop's Power, as well as that of the other Metropolitans, had its Bounds, is most manifest from the Example that is drawn from thence, for the Limits of other Churches. For what an absurd thing is it, that the Church of *Rome* should be made the Pattern for assigning the Limits to other Metropolitan Churches, if that Church also had not her known Limits at the same time when this Canon was made! Intolerable is the Exposition which *Bellarmin*, and other Romanists give of these words of the Canon; † *for as much as the Bishop of Rome also hath the like custom*, i. e. (they say,) "It was the custom of the Bishop of *Rome* to permit, or leave to the Bishop of *Alexandria* the Regimen of *Egypt*, *Libya* and *Pentapolis*. Certainly, τὸ αὐτὸ εἶναι implies a like custom in the Church of *Alexandria*, and in the Church of *Rome*; and the sense of the Canon is most evident, that the Bishop of *Alexan-*

† Ἐπειδὴ καὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἀποστόλῃ τὸ αὐτὸ εἶναι
 R *aria*

dria should, according to the ancient custom of the Church, (not by the permission of the *Roman Bishop*,) enjoy the full Power in his Province, as by the like ancient custom the *Bishop of Rome* had the Jurisdiction of his. But they that would see this Canon fully explain'd and clear'd from all the trifling Cavils and Exceptions of the *Romanists*, may consult the large and copious Annotations of the learned *Dr. Beveridge*, Bishop of *St. Asaph*, upon it, where he will receive ample satisfaction.

Thus was the Government of the Catholick Church in the Primitive Times distributed among the several chief Bishops or Primates of the Provinces, neither of them being accountable to the other, but all of them to an *Oecumenical Council*, which was then held to be the only supreme visible Judge of Controversies arising in the Church, and to have the power of finally deciding them. Hence the case of the Bishop of *Alexandria* before-mentioned, was not brought before the Bishop of *Rome*, or any other Metropolitan, but referr'd to the Fathers of the *Nicene Council* to be finally determined by them.

The universal Pastorship or Government of the Catholick Church, was never claim'd by any Bishop till towards the end of the sixth Century, and then it was thought to be challenged by *John* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, assuming to himself the Title of *Oecumenical* or *Universal Bishop*; whom *Gregory the Great*, Bishop of *Rome*, vehemently opposed, pronouncing him the forerunner of Antichrist, who durst usurp so arrogant a Title. And 'tis worthy observing how passionately the same *Gregory* expresseth his detestation of the Pride and Arrogance of the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, in his Letter to *Mauritius* the Emperour :

per
" T
" P
" o
" C
" a
" p
" a
" N
" p
this
was
of R
Mis
Titl
of th
by I
whe
Titl
an u
and
ry
appe
the
same
sum
Nay
the l
is no

†
cun
stru
men S
vanita
gloria
|| C

perour : † " I am forc'd to cry out, O the
 " Times ! O the Manners ! All things in the
 " Parts of *Europe* are deliver'd up to the power
 " of barbarous People. Cities are destroyed,
 " Castles demolished, Provinces depopulated, &c.
 " and yet the Bishops who ought to have lain
 " prostrate on the ground cover'd with Ashes
 " and Weeping, even they cover to themselves
 " Names of Vanity, and glory in new and pro-
 " phane Titles. And yet this Name of Vanity,
 this new and prophane Title of Universal Bishop,
 was afterwards accepted by *Boniface III.* Bishop
 of *Rome*, when 'twas offer'd him by that bloody
 Miscreant *Phocas* the Emperour; and the same
 Title hath been own'd by the succeeding Bishops
 of the Roman Church, and that as due to them
 by Divine Right. Indeed; it may be question'd
 whether *John* of *Constantinople*, by assuming the
 Title of *Oecumenical* Bishop, meant that he had
 an universal Jurisdiction over all other Bishops
 and Churches: But this is certain, that *Grego-*
ry opposed the Title under this Notion; this
 appearing abundantly from his || Epistle to *John*
 the Patriarch; and 'tis as certain, that under the
 same Notion the Bishops of *Rome* afterwards as-
 sum'd that Title, and do claim it to this day.
 Nay, the *Universal Pastorship* and Jurisdiction of
 the Roman Bishop over all Bishops and Churches,
 is now no longer a meer Court-Opinion, main-

† *Exclamare compellor ac dicere, O tempora ! O mores ! Ecce cuncta in Europæ partibus barbarorum juri sunt tradita, destructa urbes, eversa Castra, depopulata Provincia, &c. Et tamen Sacerdotes, qui pavimento & cinere stantes jacere debuerunt, vanitatis sibi nomina expetunt, ac novis & profanis vocabulis gloriantur.* Greg. lib. 4. Epist. 32.

|| Greg. lib. 4. Epist. 38.

tain'd only by the Pope's Parasites and Flatterers, but is become a part of the Faith of the Church of Rome; it being one of the Articles of the *Trent Creed*, to which all Ecclesiasticks are sworn themselves, and which, by the same Oath they are oblig'd to teach the Laity under their care and charge, as hereafter will appear. So that now there is no room for that Distinction, where-with some have sooth'd and pleas'd themselves, between the Church and Court of Rome; for the Court is enter'd into the Church of Rome, or rather the Court and Church of Rome are all one.

Sect. III. 2. The Church of Rome hath changed the *Primitive Canon*, or Rule of Faith, by adding new Articles to it, as necessary to be believ'd in order to Salvation: Look to the Confession of Faith, according to the *Council of Trent*. It begins indeed, with the *Primitive Rule of Faith* as explain'd by the *Council of Nice and Constantinople*; and happy had it been for the Church of Christ if it had ended there. But there are added afterwards a many new Articles, and with reference to them, as well as to the Articles of the old Creed; it concludes thus: † "This true
" Catholick Faith, without which none can be
" saved, which I now willingly profess and un-
" feignedly hold; the same I promise, vow,

† Hanc veram Catholicam fidem, extra quam nemo salvus esse potest, quam in presenti sponte profiteor, & veraciter teneo, eandem integram & inviolatam, usque ad extremum vita spiritum, constantissime (Deo adjuvante) retinere & confiteri, atque a meis subditis, vel illis quorum cura ad me spectabit, teneri, doceri, & predicari, quantum in me erit, curaturum ego idem N. spondeo, voveo ac juro: Sic me Deus adjuvet, & hac sancta Dei Evangelia.

" and

“ and swear, by the help of God, most constant-
 “ ly to keep and confess, entire and inviolate, even
 “ to my last Breath; and to endeavour moreover,
 “ to the utmost of my power, that it may be kept,
 “ taught, and professed by all my Subjects, or
 “ by those that are any way under my care.
 “ So help me God, and these his holy Gospels.

Now if you examine those Articles that fol-
 low after the *Constantinopolitan Creed*, you will
 find they are not merely *explicatory* of any Ar-
 ticle or Articles of the old Canon of Faith;
 (such as that of the *ὁμολογία* in the *Nicene Con-*
fession, which was virtually contain'd in the an-
 cient Canon, and by good consequence deducible
 from it, and was apparently also the sense of
 the Catholick Church before the *Nicene Coun-*
cil;) but they are plain *Additions* to the Rule
 of Faith. Now if these Articles were true, yet
 they ought not presently to be made a part of
 our Creed; for every Truth is not fundamen-
 tal, nor every Error damnable. We deny not
 but that General or Provincial Councils may
 make Constitutions concerning extra-fundamental
 Verities, and oblige all such as are under their
 jurisdiction to receive them, at least passively, so
 as not openly and contumaciously to oppose
 them. But to make any of these a part of the
 Creed, and to oblige all Christians under pain
 of Damnation to receive and believe them, this
 is really to add to the Creed, and to change the
 ancient *Canon* or *Rule of Faith*. But alas! these
 superadded Articles of the *Trent Creed*, are so
 far from being certain Truths, that they are most
 of them manifest Untruths, yea, gross and dan-
 gerous Errors. To make this appear, I shall
 not refuse the pains of examining some of the
 chief of them.

The first Article I shall take notice of is this;
 “ † I profess, that in the Mass is offered to God
 “ a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice for
 “ the Living and the Dead; and that in the
 “ most holy Sacrament of the *Eucharist*, there is
 “ truly, and really, and substantially the Body
 “ and Blood, together with the Soul and Divi-
 “ nity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there
 “ is wrought a Conversion of the whole substance
 “ of the Bread into the Body, and of the whole
 “ substance of the Wine into the Blood, which
 “ Conversion the Catholick Church calls *Tran-*
 “ *substantiation*. Where this Proposition [*That*
in the Mass there is offer'd to God a true, pro-
per, and propitiatory Sacrifice for the Living and
the Dead,] having that other of the *substantial*
Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the
Eucharist immediately annexed to it; the mean-
 ing of it must necessarily be this, That in the *Eu-*
charist the very Body and Blood of Christ are
 again offer'd up to God as a propitiatory Sacri-
 fice for the Sins of Men. Which is an impious
 Proposition, derogatory to the one full Satisfac-
 tion of Christ made by his Death on the Cross,
 and contrary to express Scripture, *Heb. 7.* and
27. and *9.* and *12. 15, 26, 28.* and *10. 12, 14.*
 It is true, the *Eucharist* is frequently call'd by
 the ancient Fathers *εὐχολογία*, *δυσία*, an *Oblation*,
 a *Sacrifice*. But it is to be remember'd, that

† *Profiteor in Missâ offerri Deo verum, proprium, & propitia-*
torium Sacrificium, pro vivis & defunctis, atque in sanctissimo
Eucharistia Sacramento esse verè & realiter & substantialiter Cor-
pus & Sanguinem, una cum animâ & Divinitate Domini nostri
Jesu Christi, fierique conversationem totius substantiæ Panis in
Corpus, & totius substantiæ vini in sanguinem, quam conversionem
Catholica Ecclesia Transubstantiationem appellat.

they

they say also it is *θυσία λογική καὶ ἀναιμακίη*, a reasonable Sacrifice, a Sacrifice without Blood: Which, how can it be said to be, if therein the very Blood of Christ were offer'd up to God.

They held the *Eucharist* to be a *commemorative* Sacrifice, and so do we. This is the constant Language of the ancient Liturgies, † *We offer by way of commemoration*; according to our Saviour's words when he ordain'd this holy Rite, || *Do this in commemoration of me*. In the *Eucharist* then, Christ is offer'd not *hypostatically* as the *Trent* Fathers have determin'd, (for so he was but once offer'd,) but *commemoratively* only: And this Commemoration is made to God the Father, and is not a bare remembring, or putting our selves in mind of him. For every Sacrifice is directed to God, and the Oblation therein made, whatsoever it be, hath him for its Object, and not Man. In the holy *Eucharist* therefore, we set before God the Bread and Wine, as *Figures or Images of the precious Blood of Christ shed for us, and of his precious Body*; (they are the very words of the ‡ *Clementine Liturgy*,) and plead to God the merit of his Son's Sacrifice once offer'd on the Cross for us Sinners; and in this Sacrament represented, beseeching him for the sake thereof to bestow his heavenly Blessings on us.

To conclude this matter: The Ancients held the *Oblation* of the *Eucharist* to be answerable in

† *Μεμνημένοι προσφέρωμεν* • *Commemorantes*, or *Commemorando offerimus*.

|| *Τὸ τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*. *Vid. Justin. Mart. Dial. cūm Tryph. p. 296, 297.*

‡ *Τὸ τιμὴν αἵματος* Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκχυθέντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν καὶ *τιμὴν σώματος* τὰ ἀνίστυπα. *Constitut. Apost. l. 7. c. 26.*

some respects to the legal Sacrifices; that is, they believ'd that our Blessed Saviour ordain'd the Sacrament of the *Eucharist* as a Rite of Prayer and Praise to God, instead of the manifold and bloody Sacrifices of the Law. That the *legal Sacrifices* were Rites to invoke God by, is evident from many Texts of Scripture. See especially 1 Sam. 7. 9. and 13. 12. Ezra 6. 10. Prov. 15. 8. And that they were also Rites for praising and blessing God for his Mercies, appears from 2 Chron. 29. 27. Instead therefore of slaying of Beasts, and burning of Incense, whereby they praised God, and call'd upon his Name under the Old Testament; the Fathers, I say, believed our Saviour appointed this Sacrament of Bread and Wine, as a Rite whereby to give Thanks, and make supplication to his Father in his Name. This you may see fully clear'd and prov'd by the learned Mr. Mede, in his Treatise intituled, *The Christian Sacrifice*. The *Eucharistical Sacrifice* thus explain'd, is indeed λογική Δυσία, a *reasonable Sacrifice*, widely different from that monstrous Sacrifice of the Mass, taught in the Church of Rome.

The other Branch of the Article is concerning *Transubstantiation*, wherein the Ecclesiastick professeth upon his solemn Oath his Belief, that in the Eucharist *there is made a Conversion of the whole Substance of the Bread into the Body, and of the whole Substance of the Wine into the Blood of Christ*. A Proposition that bids defiance to all the Reason and Sense of Mankind. Nor (God be praised) hath it any ground or foundation in Divine Revelation: Nay, the Text of Scripture on which the Church of Rome builds this Article, duly considered, utterly subverts and overthrows it: She grounds it upon the words of the

the
vion
whe
his
wpo
whic
fam
and
for
enx
sion
was
not
Bod
and
Blo
cess
and
sub
pla
on
and
ren
pet
We
she
II
Tr
pe
fai
cei
bel
by
an
th
th

the Institution of the holy Sacrament by our Saviour, the same Night wherein he was betrayed; when he took Bread, and brake it, and gave it to his Disciples, saying, *This is my Body*, τὸ διδομένον, saith St. Luke, τὸ κλάσμενον saith St. Paul, *which is given and broken for you*. After the same manner he took the Cup, and gave Thanks, and gave it to them, saying, *Drink ye all of this, for this is my Blood of the New Testament*, τὸ ἐκχυσόμενον, *which is shed for many for the remission of Sins*. Now whatsoever our Saviour said, was undoubtedly true: But these words could not be true in a proper sense; for our Saviour's Body was not then given, or broken, but whole and inviolate; nor was there one drop of his Blood yet shed. The words therefore must necessarily be understood in a figurative Sense; and then, what becomes of the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*? The meaning of our Saviour is plainly this: What I now do, is a representation of my Death and Passion near approaching; and what I now do, do ye hereafter, do this in remembrance of me; let this be a standing, perpetual Ordinance in my Church to the end of the World; let my Death be thus annunciated and shewn forth till I come to Judgment. See 1 Cor. II. 26.

As little Foundation hath this Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* in the ancient Church, as appears sufficiently from what hath been already said concerning the Notion then universally received of the *Eucharistical Sacrifice*. It was then believ'd to be an ἀνάμνησις, or Commemoration, by the Symbols of Bread and Wine, of the Body and Blood of Christ, once offer'd up to God on the Cross for our Redemption; it could not therefore be then thought an offering up again to God

God of the very Body and Blood of Christ, substantially present under the appearance of Bread and Wine; for these two notions are inconsistent and cannot stand together. The ancient Doctors yea, and Liturgies of the Church affirm the Eucharist to be *incrumentum sacrificium*, a sacrifice without Blood; which it cannot be said to be, if the very Blood of Christ were therein present and offer'd up to God. In the *Clementine Liturgy* the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist are said to be *Antitypa*, correspondent Types, Figures and Images of the precious Body and Blood of Christ. And diverse others of the Fathers speak in the same plain Language. *Vid. Greg. Naz. Apol. Orat. 1. Tom. 1. Cyril. Hierosol. 5. Cat. Myst. Ambros. de Sacrament. lib. 4. cap. 4.*

We are not ignorant, that the ancient Fathers, generally teach, that the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, by or upon the Consecration of them do become, and are made the *Body and Blood of Christ*. But we know also, that tho' they do not all explain themselves in the same way, yet they do all declare their sense to be very dissimilar from the Doctrine of Transubstantiation. Some of the most ancient Doctors of the Church, as *Justin Martyr*, and *Irenaeus*, seem to have had this notion, that by, or upon the sacerdotal Benediction, the Spirit of Christ, or a divine Virtue from Christ descends upon the Elements, and accompanies them to all worthy Communicants, and that therefore they are said to be, and are the Body and Blood of Christ; the same Divinity, which is hypostatically united to the Body of Christ in Heaven, being virtually united to the Elements of Bread and Wine on Earth. Which also seems to be the meaning of all the ancient Liturgies, in which it is pray'd that God would

send

send down his Spirit upon the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist. And this doubtless is the meaning of *Origen* in his eighth Book against *Celsus*, p. 399. Where speaking of the holy Eucharist he says, that therein † [“ we eat Bread by prayer (i.e. by the prayer of Consecration for the descent of the divine Spirit upon it) “ made a certain holy Body, which also sanctifies those, who “ with a sound or sincere purpose of Heart use it.] But that neither *Justin Martyr*, nor *Irenaeus*, nor *Origen* ever dream’d of the Transubstantiation of the Elements is most evident. For *Justin Martyr* and *Irenaeus* do both of them plainly affirm, that by eating and drinking the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, our Bodies are nourish’d, and that the Bread and Wine, are digested and turn’d into the Substance of our Bodies; which to affirm of the glorify’d Body of Christ, were impious and blasphemous, and to affirm the same of the mere accidents of the Bread and Wine, would be very absurd and ridiculous. And *Origen* expressly saith, “ That what we eat in the “ Eucharist is Bread, but Bread sanctify’d and “ made holy by Prayer, and which by the divine “ Virtue that accompanies it, sanctifieth all those “ who worthily receive it. He that would see more of this notion of the ancient Fathers, and particularly those places of *Justin Martyr* and *Irenaeus* fully clear’d and vindicated, from the forced and absurd glosses of the Romanists, may consult my learned Friend Mr. *Grabe*, in his notes upon *Justin Martyr*’s first Apology of his own Edition, p. 128, 129. but especially in his large and elaborate Annotation upon *Irenaeus*, lib. 4. cap. 34.

† Ἅγιος ἐδιδόκη σῶμα ἡγιασμένον, διὰ τὸ εὐχλὴν αἰγιόνα τε καὶ αἰεταῖον ποιεῖν μετ’ ὁγιᾶς παθέρσεως αὐτοῦ ἡγιασμένον.

I shall dismiss this Article with this one only observation, that after the prodigious Doctrine of Transubstantiation was confirm'd by the first *Lateran* Council, there were many in the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, who could not digest it, did not in truth believe it, and wish'd from their Hearts that their Church had never defin'd it. For this we have the ample Testimonies of very eminent Writers of that Church.

" The conversion of the Bread and Wine into
 " Christ's Body and Blood, saith *Cajetan*, *par.* 3.
 " *qu.* 75. *Article* 1. all of us do teach in words.
 " but indeed many deny it, thinking nothing less.
 " These are diversely divided one from another.
 " For some by the Conversion that is in the Sa-
 " crament, understand nothing but identity of
 " place, that is, that the Bread is therefore said
 " to be made the Body of Christ, because where
 " the Bread is, the Body of Christ becomes pre-
 " sent also. Others understand by the word *con-*
 " *version* nothing else but the order of Succe-
 " sion, that is, that the Body succeedeth and is
 " under the veils of accidents, under which the
 " Bread, which they suppose to be annihilated
 " was before. *Occam*, *Centilogii conclus.* cap. 19.
 faith, " There are three Opinions about Transub-
 " stantiation, of which the first supposeth a con-
 " version of the sacramental Elements, the second
 " the annihilation, the third affirmeth the Bread
 " to be in such manner transubstantiated into
 " the Body of Christ, that it is no way chang'd
 " in substance, or substantially converted into
 " Christ's Body, or doth cease to be, but only
 " that the Body of Christ in every part of it,
 " becomes present in every part of the Bread.
Waldensis, *Tom.* 2. *de Sacram. Eucharistie*, cap. 19.
 reports out of *Christopolitanus Zacharias* his

Book

Book entituled *Quatuor unum*, " That there were
 " some, perhaps many, but hardly to be discern'd
 " and noted, who thought still as *Berengarius*
 " did. The same *Waldensis*, in the same Book,
 cap. 64. saith, " That some supposed the con-
 " version that is in the Sacrament, to be, in that
 " the Bread and Wine are assum'd into the unity
 " of Christ's Person ; some thought it to be by
 " way of impanation, and some by way of figu-
 " rative and tropical appellation. The first and
 " second of these Opinions, found the better en-
 " tertainment in some Mens minds, because they
 " grant the essential presence of Christ's Body,
 " and yet deny not the presence of the Bread still
 " remaining, to sustain the appearing accidents.
 " These Opinions he reports to have been very
 " acceptable to many, not without sighs wishing
 " the Church had decreed that Men should follow
 " one of them.

It cannot be doubted, but that there are at this
 day many in the Communion of the Church of
Rome, who are in the same perplexity about this
 Article of Transubstantiation, and have the same
 wishes, that their Church had never made it an
 Article of their Faith ; for the absurdities of
 Transubstantiation, and the reason of Mankind,
 are still the same. Now what a lamentable con-
 dition are they in, who are forced to profess (yea
 and all Ecclesiasticks now by the *Trent* Confession
 in the most solemn manner to swear) that they
 believe what they cannot for their Hearts believe ;
 whose Consciences, between the determinations
 of their Church, and the dictates of their own
 reason, yea and sense too, are continually ground,
 as between two Millstones ! I have been long up-
 on this Article ; but shall be more brief on the
 next.

The

The next Article is this: "I ‡ confesse also, that
 "under one kind only whole and entire Christ,
 "and the whole Sacrament is received. Now
 this Article of the *sufficiency of the Sacrament of
 the Eucharist taken only in one kind*, as it refers
 to, and is design'd to justify the practice of the
 Roman Church, in the constant and publick ad-
 ministration of the Sacrament to all the Laity
 only in one kind, viz. the Bread, denying them
 the Cup; is manifestly against our Saviour's first
 Institution of the Sacrament, against Apostolical
 Practice, and the Usage of the Universal Church
 of Christ for a thousand Years, as is confessed by
 diverse learned Men of the Roman Communion.
 And yet according to the *Trent Creed* all Men
 are damn'd that do not assent to the insolent
 (and as I may justly term it) *Antichristian De-
 cree* of the *Roman Church* in this point. And
 who can without astonishment reflect on the stiff-
 ness, and obstinacy; and uncharitableness of the
Trent Fathers in this matter! Before they met,
 when it was noised, that a Council should be
 called to redress the manifold Abuses and Cor-
 ruptions that were in the Church, it was the
 longing expectation, and earnest desire of many
 good Men, that amongst other things, the Com-
 munion in both kinds might be restor'd to the
 Laity. There were a multitude of pious Souls,
 as it were upon their knees before them, thirst-
 ing after the Cup of Blessing, and earnestly beg-
 ging for an entire Sacrament. But those *Duri
 Patres*, those hard-hearted Fathers had no com-
 passion on them, turn'd a deaf ear to their loud
 crys and supplications, only bidding them believe

‡ Fateor etiam sub alterâ tantum specie, totum atque inte-
 grum Christum verumque Sacramentum sumi.

for the future (what they could not believe) that half the Sacrament was every whit as good as the whole.

Immediately follows this Article : " I * firmly hold that there is a Purgatory, and that the Souls detained there are relieved by the Prayers of the Faithful. Now this Article of a *Purgatory after this Life*, as it is understood and taught by the *Roman Church* (that is, to be a place and state of misery and torment, whereinto many faithful Souls go presently after death, and there remain till they are thoroughly purged from their dross, or delivered thence by Masses, Indulgences, &c.) is contrary to Scripture, and the sense of the *Catholick Church* for at least the first *four Centuries*, as I have at large proved in a Discourse concerning the *State of the Souls of Men in the interval between Death and the Resurrection* : Which I am ready to communicate to *Monsieur de Meaux* if he shall desire it. Indeed the Doctrine of *Purgatory* is not only an Error, but a dangerous one too, which (I am verily persuaded) hath betray'd a multitude of Souls into eternal perdition, who might have escaped Hell, if they had not depended upon an after-game in *Purgatory*. But this Article being very gainful to the *Roman Clergy*, must above others, be held fast, and constantly maintain'd and defended. " I || firmly hold it.

Prayers for the dead, as founded on the Hypothesis of *Purgatory* (and we no otherwise reject them) fall together with it. The Prayers for the dead used in the ancient Church (those

* *Constanter teneo, Purgatorium esse, animasque ibi detentas, fidelium suffragiis juvari.*

|| *Constanter teneo.*

I mean that were more properly Prayers, *i. e.* either deprecations, or petitions) were of two sorts, either the common and general commemoration of all the faithful at the oblation of the holy Eucharist, or the particular Prayers used at the Funerals of any of the Faithful lately deceased. The former respected their final absolution, and the Consummation of their Bliss at the Resurrection; like as that our Church useth both in the Office for the Communion, and in that for the Burial of the Dead: Which indeed seems to be no more than what we daily pray for in that petition of the Lord's Prayer (if we rightly understand it) *Thy Kingdom come.* The latter were also charitable omens, and good wishes of the Faithful living, as it were accompanying the Soul of the deceased to the joys of Paradise, of which they believed it already possess'd, as the ancient Author of the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* in his last Chapter of that Book plainly informs us. In a word, let any understanding and unprejudiced Person attentively observe the Prayers for the dead in the most undoubtedly ancient Liturgies, especially those in the *Clementine Liturgy*, and those mentioned in the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*; and he will be so far from believing the *Roman Purgatory* upon the account of those Prayers, that he must needs see they make directly against it. For they all run (as even that Prayer for the dead, which is unadvisedly left by the Romanists in their own *Canon* of the Mass, as a Testimony against themselves) in this form: *For all that are in peace or at rest in the Lord.* Now how can they be said to be in peace or at rest in the Lord, who are supposed to be in a state of Misery and Torment?

The

The next Article is this : " As † also that the
 " Saints reigning together with Christ are to be
 " venerated and invoked, and that they offer up
 " Prayers to God for us ; and that their Relicks
 " are to be venerated. Now for the *Worship and
 Invocation of Saints deceased* there is no ground
 or foundation in the Holy Scriptures, no Precept,
 no Example. Nay it is by evident consequence
 forbidden in the prohibition of the *Worship and
 Invocation of Angels*, *Col. 2. v. 18.* with which
 Text compare the 35 Canon of the Council of
Laodicea, and the judgment of the learned Fa-
 ther *Theodoret* concerning it, who flourished
 shortly after that Council. He in his Notes up-
 on that Text of *St. Paul*, hath these express
 words, *The ‡ Synod met at Laodicea in Phrygia
 made a Law forbidding Men to pray even to the
 Angels.* See also *Zonaras* upon the same Canon.
 He as well as *Theodoret* long before him, rightly
 judged, that both in the Text of *St. Paul*, and
 in the *Laodicean Canon*, all Prayers to Angels are
 forbidden. Now if we must not pray to Angels,
 then much less may we pray to Saints. The An-
 gels are ministring Spirits, sent forth to minister
 to them who shall be Heirs of Salvation : They
 watch over us, and are frequently present with
 us, nay they are *internuncii*, Messengers between
 God and us, conveying God's Blessings to us and
 our Prayers to God, *Act. 10.* & 4. *Apoc. 8.* & 3.
 none of which things are any where affirm'd of

† Similiter & sanctos una cum Christo regnantes venerandos &
 invocandos esse, eosque orationes Deo pro nobis offerre, eorumque reli-
 quias esse venerandas.

‡ Ἡ Σύνοδος συναλεθύσα ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ τῇ Φρυγίας νόμον
 κεκόλυκε καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις προσέχειν.

the deceased Saints. And yet we must not pray even to the Angels.

Hear also *Origen* who lived long before the *Laodicean* Council, delivering the sense of the Church of his time in this matter, *lib. 5. contra Cels. p. 233. Edit. Contrab.* where he excellently discourseth against the religious Worship and Invocation of Angels, in opposition to which he first lays down this as a received Doctrine among all Catholick Christians, "That tall Prayers, all "Supplications, Deprecations and Thanksgivings "are to be offered to God the Lord of all, by "the Chief High Priest, who is above all An- "gels, the living Word, and God. And pre- sently after he shews the folly and unreasonableness of praying to Angels upon several accounts. As first, because the particular knowledge of Angels, and what offices they severally perform is a secret which we cannot reach to; which is the very reason which *St. Paul* suggests in the Text before-mentioned, that whosoever Worships and Invokes the Angels, doth intrude † into those things which he hath not seen. From whence we may easily gather, that *Origen* in this discourse of his, had an eye to that Text of *St. Paul*, and understood it as we do, to be a prohibition of all Prayer to Angels. 2. He argues that if we should suppose that we could attain such particular knowledge of the Angels, yet it would not be lawful for us to pray to them, or any other, save to God the Lord of all, who alone is all-sufficient, abundantly able to supply all our

† *Omnia vota, omnes interpellationes deprecationes & gratiarum actiones offerendas esse Deo rerum omnium Domino, per majorem omnibus Angelis summum Pontificem, vivum Verbum & Deum.*

* *Ἄ μὴ ἐώγαμεν ἐμὲ αὐτὸν δεῖν.*

wants and necessities, through our Saviour Jesus Christ, the Son of God, his Word, Wisdom and Truth. Lastly, He reasons to this effect, that the best way to gain the good will of those blessed Spirits is not to pray to them, but to imitate them by paying our Devotions to God alone, as they do. Hear the same *Origen*, lib. 8. p. 402. where to *Celsus* talking of those Spirits that preside over the affairs of Men here below, who were thought to be appeased only by Prayers to them in a barbarous Language, he answers with derision, and tells him, he forgot with whom he had to do, and that he was speaking to Christians, who † pray to God alone thro' Jesus. And then he adds, that the genuine Christians in their prayers to God, used no barbarous words, but prayed to him in the language of their respective Countries, the *Greek* Christians in the *Greek* Tongue, the *Romans* in the *Roman* Language, as knowing that the God to whom they prayed understood all Tongues and Languages, and heard and accepted their Prayers in their several Languages, as well as if they had address'd themselves to him in one and the same Language. Again in the same Book. p. 420. to *Celsus* discoursing much after the same rate, he gives this excellent answer: "The ‡ one God is to be at-
"ton'd by us, the Lord of all, and must be en-
"treated to be propitious to us, Piety and

† Τοῖς μόνῳ τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐυχόμενοι.

‡ Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἓν ἑστὶν ὁ Θεός, &c. Unus est nobis placandus Deus universorum Dominus atque ut propitius sit exorandus, qui utique pietate & precibus placatur. Si vult post hunc placari etiam alios; cogitet quod sicut moto corpore, umbra quoque ipsius movetur, ita, cum aliquis Deum habet propitium, sequitur ut amicos habeat omnes ejus Angelos, Animas & Spiritus.

" Prayers being the best means of appeasing him.
 " And if *Celsus* would have others applied to af-
 " ter him, let him assure himself, that as the
 " Body's Motion unavoidably moves its Shadow,
 " so likewise when God is once become propiti-
 " ous to any, all his Angels, Souls, and Spirits,
 " will become Friends to such an one. From
 these Testimonies of *Origen*, to which more might
 be added, it is very evident that the Catholick
 Christians of his time, made no Prayers either to
 Angels or Saints, but directed all their Prayers
 to God through the alone mediation of Jesus
 Christ our Saviour. Indeed, against the Invoca-
 tion of Angels and Saints, we have the concur-
 rent Testimonies of all the Catholick Fathers of
 the first three Centuries at least. For as to that
 Testimony of *Justin Martyr* in his second (or
 rather first) Apology for the Christians, p. 56.
 alledged by *Bellarmin*, and others of his Party,
 for the worshipping of Angels as practised in the
 Primitive Times of the Church ; I have given
 a clear account of it *Def. Fid. Nic.* §. 2. c. 4.
 §. 8. where I have evidently proved that place of
Justin to be so far from giving any countenance
 to the Religious Worship of Angels, that it makes
 directly against it. And the like may be easily
 shewn of the other Allegations of *Bellarmino* out
 of the Primitive Fathers.

To conclude ; Look into the most antient Li-
 turgies, as particularly that described in the *Ec-
 clesiastical Hierarchy*, and the *Clementine Liturgy*,
 contain'd in the Book, entituled, the *Apostoli-
 cal Constitutions* ; and you will not find in them
 one Prayer of any sort to Angels or Saints, no,
 not so much as an oblique Prayer, (as they term
 it,) i. e. a Prayer directed to God, that he would
 hear the intercession of Angels and Saints for us.

And

And yet after all this, they are for ever damn'd by the *Trent* Creed, who do not hold and practise the invocation of the Saints deceased. For this is one of the Articles of that Creed, without the belief whereof, they tell us, * *none can be saved*: That is, all are damned who pray unto God alone through Christ the Mediator, as the Scripture directs, and the Catholick Church of the first and best Ages hath practised.

As to what follows, *that the Saints departed do offer up their Prayers to God for us*, if it be understood of the intercession of the Saints in general, we deny it not. But this is no reason why we should pray to them to pray for us. Nay, on the contrary, if the deceased Saints do of their own accord, and out of their perfect Charity pray for us, what need we be so solicitous to call upon them for their Prayers, especially, when our Reason and Scripture also tell us, that we are out of their hearing, and that they do not, cannot know our particular Wants and Necessities? For, as to what the Romanists tell us of the *Glass of the Trinity*, and extraordinary Revelations, they are bold presumptuous Conjectures, destitute of any ground or colour from Reason or Scripture, and indeed are inconsistent with one another. To be sure, that conceit of the *Glass of the Trinity* would never have passed with the Fathers of the first Ages: For they generally held, *That the Souls of the Righteous* (some indeed excepted of the Souls of the Martyrs,) *do not presently after Death ascend to the third Heaven, but go to a place and state of inferior Bliss and Happiness,* (which they commonly call by the Name of *Paradise*, tho' where

* *Nemo saluus esse potest.*

it is situated they do not all agree,) and there remain till the Resurrection of their Bodies ; after which, they shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, and there for ever enjoy that consummate Bliss and Happiness which consists in that clear Vision of God, which the holy Scripture calls seeing him Face to Face. And indeed, their distinction of Paradise (the receptacle of holy Souls presently after Death,) from the third Heaven, seems to have firm ground in the New Testament. *Vide Luke 23. 43. 2 Cor. 12. and 2. 3, 4. and Grot. in Loca;* and was undoubtedly received in the Church of God before the coming of the Lord in the Flesh. However, this was a current Doctrine in the Christian Church for many Ages ; till at length the Popish Council of Florence boldly determin'd the contrary, defining, † *That those Souls, which having contracted the blemish of Sin, being either in their Bodies, or out of them, purged from it, are presently received into Heaven, and there clearly behold God himself, one God in three Persons, as he is.* This Decree they craftily made, partly to establish the Superstition of praying to Saints deceased, whom they would make us to believe to see and know all our Necessities and Concerns in *speculo Trinitatis*, as was said before, and so to be fit Objects of our religious Invocation ; partly and chiefly to confirm the Doctrine of Purgatory, and that the Prayers of the ancient Church for the Dead, might be thought to be founded upon a supposition that the Souls of some, nay, most faithful Persons after Death go into a place of grievous Torment, out of which

† *Eas animas que post contractam peccati maculam, &c.* they

they may be deliver'd by the Prayers, Masses, and Alms of the Living. But this by the way.

It is added in the Creed, *That not only the Saints themselves, but also their Reliques are to be worship'd.* A strange definition of the Trent Fathers, especially if we consider the time when it was made; a time when the best and wisest Men in the Roman Communion sadly complain'd of the vile Cheat put upon the poor ignorant People, by shewing them I know not what Reliques of Saints, and drawing them to the Worship of them, only for Gain's sake, and to pick their Pockets. Hear the Judgment of the learned and pious *Cessander*, as to this Article: || " See-
" ing there are a small number of true and ap-
" proved Reliques, especially in these Provinces,
" and many of those which are made shew of,
" are too apparently liable to Suspicion, and the
" frequenting and veneration of them is of little
" service to true Piety and Devotion, though of
" very much to Superstition or Gain; it seems to
" me much more proper, that all such Ostenta-
" tion of Miracles were forborn, and the People
" were invited to worship the true Reliques
" of Saints; that is, the Examples of Piety and
" Virtue they have left behind them for our imi-
" tation, as is recorded in what has been writ-
" ten either by them, or of them.

|| *Cum vera & comperta reliquia, praesertim in his Provinciis perpaucæ sint, & multa ex iis quæ ostentantur non temerè suspecta haberi possint, atque illorum frequentatio & veneratio non multum pietati, plurimum verò superstitioni vel questui serviant; multò consultius videtur, ut ab omni reliquiarum ostentatione ab-
sineatur, & populus ad veras Sanctorum reliquias colendas, id est, exempla Pietatis & virtutum quæ in Scriptis, vel ab ipsis, vel de ipsis extant invitanda provocetur.*

The next Article of the *Trent* Creed is this:
 “ † I most firmly assert, that the Images of
 “ Christ, and the ever Virgin, Mother of God,
 “ and other Saints, are to be had and retain’d,
 “ and that due Honour and Veneration are to be
 “ given them. A doughty Article indeed, wor-
 thy to be usher’d in with a *Firmissimè assero!*
 But is this really an Article of the Catholick
 Christian Faith, without the belief whereof there
 is no Salvation? What then is become again
 of the Catholick Church of the first three Cen-
 turies and downwards? For it is certain, that
 the Church of those Days never allowed the use
 of Images in her Oratories or Conventicles, much
 less the Adoration and Worship of them. This
 appears from what we read of *Adrian* the Ro-
 man Emperour, related by *Ælius Lampridius* in
 the Life of *Alexander Severus*, that he favour-
 ing the Christians, and willing to gratifie them
 in their way of Worship, commanded that they
 should have Temples built for them without any
 Images in them; as well knowing their utter
 averstation to the setting up of Images in the pla-
 ces of their religious Worship. This also more
 plainly appears from the Writings of the Chri-
 stian Apologists of those Times against the Hea-
 thens objecting to them, that they had no Images
 that they worship’d, and consequently, that they
 were Atheists, and worship’d no God at all; for
 they thought there could be no religious Wor-
 ship of any thing without some visible Image of
 the Object to be worship’d, and finding no

† *Firmissimè assero imagines Christi ac Deipara semper Virgi-
 nis, nec non aliorum Sanctorum habendas & retinendas esse, atque
 eis debitum honorem & venerationem impertiendam.*

Image

Image at all, of any sort in the Oratories of the Christians, they concluded that the Christians worship'd no Deity. Now our Apologists are so far from pleading to this Objection, that the Christians had Images in their places of Worship, that they answer without any distinction, by way of concession, and that not only granting that they had no Images, but affirming they ought not to have them, and condemn'd the Gentiles which had. See *Minutius Felix*, *Arnobius* and *Lactantius*.

In the fourth Century indeed, there were some attempts to bring in Pictures into the Christian Oratories, but they were presently check'd and repress'd by the Governours of the Church, as appears from the 36th Canon of the Council of *Eliberis* in *Spain*, and from the Relation which *Epiphanius* gives us, (who flourish'd towards the end of the fourth Century,) in his Epistle to *John* Bishop of *Jerusalem*, translated by *St. Jerome* out of *Greek* into *Latin*. *Tom. 2. Oper. Hieronymi*; where he tells *John* of *Jerusalem*, that going into a Church in the Village of *Anablatha* to pray, he found there a Picture hanging up, which (tho' it were out of his own Diocese,) he cut in pieces, as being scandalous and contrary to the holy Scriptures; and desires *John* to take care for the future, that no such Pictures be hung up in any Church under his Jurisdiction. The words of *Epiphanius* are these: † "At my entrance into the Church to pray, I saw there a
Veil

† Cum intrassem in Ecclesiam ut orarem inveni ibi velum pendens in foribus ejusdem Ecclesie tinctum atque depictum, et habens imaginem quasi Christi, vel Sancti cujusdam, non enim satis memini cujus Imago fuerit; cum ergo hoc vidissem, in Ecclesia

" Veil hanging within the Doors of the same
 " Church, died and painted, and having the
 " Image as it were of Christ, or some Saint,
 " for I do not well remember whose it was.
 " When therefore I had seen this Image of a
 " Man hanging in the Church of Christ, a-
 " gainst the Authority of the Scriptures, I tore it
 " in pieces, and advised the Keepers of the place to
 " wrap therewith a poor dead Man, and carry him
 " to burial in it. And whereas they on the other
 " hand murmured, saying, that if he would tear
 " the Veil, he ought in justice to change it, and
 " give them another for it; I no sooner heard
 " this, but I promised to give them one, and
 " that I would send it presently. However, some
 " little time past, whilst I was seeking after the
 " best Veil, to send them it; for I thought I must
 " send one from Cyprus. But now I have sent
 " such as I could meet with; and I beseech thee,
 " command the Presbyters of that place to re-
 " ceive the Veil we have sent from the Bearer,
 " and to command for the future, that no such
 " Veils as are contrary to our Religion be hung
 " up in the Church of Christ. For it becomes

*Ecclesia Christi contra auctoritatem Scripturarum hominis pendere
 imaginem, scidi illud, & magis dedi consilium custodibus ejusdem
 loci, ut pauperem mortuum eo obvoluerent & efferrent. Illique
 contra murmurantes dixerunt, si scindere voluerat, justum erat ut
 aliud daret velum atque mutaret. Quod cum audissem, me datu-
 rum esse pollicitus sum, & illico esse missum. Paululum autem
 morarum fuit in medio, dum quaro optimum velum pro eo mittere,
 arbitrabar enim de Cypro mihi esse mittendum. Nunc autem misi,
 quod potui reperire, & precor ut jubeas Presbyteros ejusdem loci
 suscipere velum a latore, quod a nobis missum est: & deinceps
 precipere, ut in Ecclesia Christi istiusmodi vela, qua contra reli-
 gionem nostram veniunt, non appendi. Decet enim honestatem
 tuam hanc magis habere sollicitudinem, ut scrupulositatem tollas,
 qua indigna est Ecclesia Christi, & populis qui tibi crediti sunt.*

thy

“ thy Worth to have the greater care in this respect, that thou mayest take away all such scrupulosity as is unworthy of the Christian Church, and the People committed to thy charge. The Authority of this Epistle is vindicated from the Cavils of *Bellarmin*, by the learned *Andrew Rivet*, in his *Critica Sacr. Spec. lib. 3. cap. 29*. How would the Zeal of this great and good Bishop have been inflam’d, if he had seen what we now a-days see, not only Pictures, but massie Images in Churches, and People praying, kneeling, and burning Incense before them!

By what means Image-Worship in After-Ages enter’d into the Church, is not so easie to tell; nor is it very necessary. But this is certain, that about the beginning of the eighth Century it had gotten great ground. For in the Year of our Lord 754, in the Reign of *Constantine*, nick-nam’d *Copronymus*, a General Council was convened at *Constantinople*, consisting of 338 Bishops, declaring it self the seventh General Council. *Vide Syn. CP. in Act. Syn. Nic. 2. p. 621. Edit. Col. An. 1618*. This Synod expressly condemn’d all Worship of Images, decreeing it to be abominable; and that all Images of whatsoever Matter or Colour they were made, should be cast out of all Christian Churches. *Ibid. p. 965*. And presently after, they decree severe Punishments to any Man that should dare from thence forward, to make, worship, or set up in the Church, or in his own House, any such Image, as being a transgressor of the Commandment of God, and an enemy to the Doctrine of the Fathers. Where observe, that the Bishops of this Council condemn all Image-Worship, as contrary both to Scripture, and also to the Doctrine of the Fathers of the Church
that

that were before them, as indeed we have already shewn it to be. In this Council, *Germanus* Bishop of *Constantinople*, *Georgius Cyprius*, and *Damascene* a Monk, who were the chief sticklers for Image-Worship, were excommunicated.

About 30 Years after, viz. *An. 787*, another Council met at *Constantinople* first, and was afterwards translated to *Nice*, in which the Decree of the former Synod was exploded, and Image-Worship first establish'd in the Church. This Council was call'd by the Empress *Irene* a bigotted Image-Worshipper: She had so great an influence upon this Synod, that partly by her Persuasions, partly by her Threatnings, several Bishops who in the former Synod had condemn'd Image-Worship, were now for it. Among these, *Basilus* Bishop of *Ancyra*, *Theodorus* Bishop of *Myra*, and *Theodosius* Bishop of *Amorium*, were brought in as *Pompe Circences*, and offer'd to this Council their Letters supplicant, confessing that they had sinn'd in condemning the Worship of Images in the Synod convened by *Constantinus Copronymus*: *Dux famina facti*. It was a Woman that first brought this childish Worship (the great *Hincmar* of *Rhemes* calls it *Puparum cultum*, *Baby-Worship*,) into the Church of Christ. The Bishops in this Synod, being destitute of Scripture Proof and Authentick Tradition for their Image-Worship, betook themselves * to certain *Apocryphal* and ridiculous Stories, as *Charles the Great* observ'd. For in this Synod, a Letter from *Adrian* Bishop of *Rome*, to *Constantine* and *Irene*, was produced,

* *Ad Apocryphas quasdam & risu dignas naviat.* Car. M. l. 3. c. 3.

and openly read, full of the most ridiculous Fables, as particularly concerning the Leprosie of *Constantine the Great* before his Conversion; the barbarous Remedy that he sought after by the Blood of innocent Babes, the appearing of *St. Peter* and *St. Paul* to him in a Dream, advising him to send for *Pope Sylvester*, who, upon we know not what Persecution raised by *Constantine* against the *Christians*, was fled with his Clergy to the Mountain *Soracte*, and there hid themselves in the Caves thereof; that when *Sylvester* came to him, he commanded his Deacons to produce the Images of *St. Peter* and *Paul*, which as soon as the Emperour saw, he cryed out aloud, *These are the very Images that I saw in my Dream; I am convinced, I believe, and desire the Laver of Baptism*; which, when he had received, he was immediately cured of his Leprosie: That thereupon, in gratitude for the benefit he had received, he order'd Churches to be built for the *Christians*, whose Walls and Pillars should be adorn'd with the holy Images of Christ and the Saints. Was there ever such a Legend offer'd to a Synod of Bishops? And yet this Letter of *Adrian* was accepted, and approved of by the whole Council. Had none of them read the Life of *Constantine*, written by *Eusebius*?

Wherefore, about seven Years after, viz. *An. 794*, this *Nicene Synod* was condemn'd, and abdicated, by a Council of about 300 Bishops convened at *Frankford* by *Charles the Great*, King of *France*. In this Synod, were present not only the Bishops of *France*, but also of *Germany* and *Lombardy*, as Provinces subdued to the King of *France*. *Pope Adrian* also sent his Legates thither, and the Great *Charles* himself honoured this Council with his Presence.

The

The Romanists are hard put to it to ward the stroke of this Council against the Worshippers of Images. They have several evasions. † *Genebrard* and ‡ *Bellarmino* tell us that the Fathers at *Frankford* mistook the meaning of the 2d *Nicene* Council, as thinking they had decreed " || The " Worship due to God alone to be given to the Images of the Saints, which they were very far from doing. But it is far more probable that *Genebrard* and *Bellarmino* were both grossly mistaken. There were assembled in this Council almost all the learned Bishops of the West; they had the Acts of the 2d *Nicene* Synod before them, and diligently perused them, and upon examination condemn'd them as to the point of Image Worship. Besides, our *Alcuinus*, the Emperor's Tutor, the most learned Man of that Age, had before so fully examin'd the *Nicene* Acts, that he wrote a learned Discourse against them, and notably refuted them, as we shall hear by and by. Lastly, it is certain that the Fathers of the Council of *Frankford* did not condemn only *Cultum latria* to be given to Images, but all manner of religious Worship.

* Others therefore tell us that they who urge the Testimony of the *Frankford* Synod against Image Worship are utterly mistaken; that the Synod which the Fathers at *Frankford* condemn'd was not the Council of *Nice*, but that of *Constantinople* under *Constantinus Copronimus*; that the

† *Geneb. lib. 3. Chron. An. 794.*

‡ *Bellarmino. lib. 2. de Imag. cap. 14.*

|| *Cultum latria.*

* *Surius in admon. ad Lectorem pro Syn. Frank. Coriolanus in Concilio Frank. ad. An. 794.*

Frankford Synod perfectly agreed with the Fathers of the *Nicene* Council, and confirm'd the worship of Images. This is strange news indeed, but it is far from being true. The mistake of those Writers who tell us this (if it were a mistake in them, and not a wilful prevarication) arose from hence, that the Synod which established Image Worship met first (as I noted before) at *Constantinople*, tho' it was afterwards translated to *Nice*, and so might be truly said to be a Council convened at *Constantinople*, and thereupon be mistaken for that Council of *Constantinople*, which was convened by *Constantinus Copronymus*, which was indeed confirm'd by the *Frankford* Fathers. But that it was the second Council of *Nice*, that was condemn'd by the Synod at *Frankford*, and that upon this very account that it had introduced Image Worship into the Church, we have abundant evidence.

For this is testified not only by *Walfridus Strabo*, but also by *Ado Viennensis* and *Regino Pruniensis* in their Histories; with whom *Abbas Usspergensis* agrees in his Chronicle, where he thus writes: "In † the Year 793, whilst Charles
" was celebrating the Feast of Easter in France,
" a numerous Synod of Bishops was gathered to-
" gether out of all the Provinces of the Realm,
" the Legates of Pope *Adrian* were there also in

† Anno Dom. DCCXCIII. Carolo in Franc: Paschâ celebrante, Synodus Episcoporum magna collecta est, ex omnibus regni provinciis; Legati quoque *Hadriani* Papæ in ejus vicem affuerunt. In hac Synodo Hæresis ejusdam Episcopi *Felici*s nomine damnata est. --- Synodus etiam, quæ ante paucos annos in *Constantinopoli* congregata est, sub *Hirene* & *Constantino* filio ejus septima & universalis appellata est, ut nec septima, nec aliquid diceretur, quasi supervacua ab omnibus abdicata est.

" his stead. In this Synod the Hereſie of a cer-
 " rain Biſhop named *Felix* was condemned.—
 " The Synod likewise which a few Years before
 " met at *Constantinople*, under *Irene* and *Con-*
 " *stantine* her Son, and was called the seventh
 " General Council, was univerſally renounced
 " as uſeleſs, that ſo it might neither be ſtiled the
 " 7th, nor by any other name. That the Council
 here ſaid to be condemned by the *Frankford* Sy-
 nod was the ſecond Council of *Nice* is evident,
 for it is expreſſly ſaid to be the Council conven'd
 under the Empreſs *Irene*, and *Constantine* her Son,
 and that but a few Years before. But it is ſaid
 to be conven'd at *Constantinople* becauſe there in-
 deed it firſt met, as was noted before.

Add to this the Teſtimony of *Hincmar* of
Rhemes, an Author in all reſpects moſt worthy
 of credit in this matter: " In † the time of the
 " Emperor *Charlemaign*, a General Synod was
 " held in *France* by order of the Apoſtolick See,
 " the ſaid Emperor convening it. And according
 " to the direction of the holy Scriptures, and the
 " Tradition of the Ancients, the Greek Synod
 " was condemned and wholly laid aſide. Of
 " the Condemnation whereof a Volume of no
 " ſmall ſize was ſent from the ſame Emperor to
 " *Rome* by ſome of the Biſhops, and I my ſelf
 " have read it in the Palace in my younger days:

† Tempore Caroli magni Imperatoris, jussu ſedis Apoſtolica
 generalis Synodus in Franciâ convocante præfato Imperatore celebra-
 ta eſt, & ſecundum Scripturarum Tramitem Traditionemque ma-
 jorum ipſa Græca Synodus deſtructa eſt & penitus abdicata; de
 cujus deſtructione non modicum volumen, quod in Palatio adoleſcen-
 tulus legi, ab eodem Imperatore Romam eſt per quosdam Episcopos
 miſſum. *Hincmar. Rhem. adv. Hincmar. Laudon, Cap. 20.*

In the same Chapter he afterwards adds;
 “ † Wherefore by the Authority of this Synod,
 “ the Worship of Images was somewhat re-
 “ strained: Yet not so, but that *Adrian* and
 “ the other Bishops persevered in their Opinion;
 “ and after the Death of *Charles*, most earnestly
 “ promoted their Puppet-Worship: Insomuch
 “ that *Lewis*, *Charles*’s Son, wrote a Book, where-
 “ in he fell much sharper upon the Worship of
 “ Images than his Father had done.

With what indignation and abhorrence the De-
 cree of the *Nicene Pseudo-Synod* was received
 by our *British Church*, our Historians tell us.
 Hear *Roger Hoveden*. * “ *Charles* King of France,
 “ sent the Book of the Council, directed to him-
 “ self from *Constantinople*, into *Britain*, in which
 “ Book, alas! alas! many things were found
 “ unagreeable, and contrary to the true Faith;
 “ especially, that by the unanimous assertion of
 “ almost all the Eastern Doctors, that is to say,

† *Authoritate itaque hujus Synodi non nihil repressa est imagi-
 num veneratio: sed tamen Hadrianus & alii Pontifices in sua
 opinione perseverarunt; & mortuo Carolo suarum Puppæ cultum
 vehementius promoverunt; adeo ut Ludovicus, Caroli Fi-
 lius, Libro longe acriori inspectatus sit imaginum cultum, quam
 Carolus.*

* *Carolus Rex Francorum, misit Synodalem Librum ad Bri-
 tanniam sibi à Constantinopoli directum, in quo Libro (heu,
 pro dolor!) multa inconvenientia & verè fidei contraria re-
 periebantur; maxime quod pene omnium Orientalium Doctorum,
 non minus quam trecentorum; vel eo amplius Episcoporum, unanimi
 assertionem confirmatum fuerit, imagines adorari debere, quod om-
 nino Ecclesia Dei execratur. Contra quod Scripsit Alcuinus Epi-
 stolam ex Authoritate divinarum Scripturaram mirabiliter affir-
 matam, illamque cum eodem Libro, ex personâ Episcoporum &
 Principum nostrorum Regi Francorum attulit: Rog. Hoved.
 Part I. Annal. ad Ann. 792. Vide & Matth. Westmon. ad
 Ann. 793.*

" of not less than Three hundred or more Bishops,
 " the Worship of Images was confirmed : Which
 " the Church of God utterly abominated. Against
 " which, *Alcuinus* wrote an Epistle wonderfully
 " supported with Authorities out of the Holy
 " Scriptures, and brought it with the same Book
 " to the King of *France*, in the Name of our
 " Bishops and Princes.

From whence it appears, that the *Nicene* Acts
 sent from *Constantinople* to *Charles* the Great,
 were by him before the *Frankford* Synod first
 sent to *Britain*; and being examin'd, and abundantly
 refuted, and that from the Holy Scriptures, by our
 most learned *Alcuinus*, were carried back again,
 together with that Refutation of them, to the
 Emperour in the Name of our Bishops and Princes:
 So that even *then*, the *British* Church was
 Protestant in this Article concerning Image-Worship.

And indeed, I am persuaded that no Man of
 Judgment and Integrity, that hath been conversant
 in the Holy Scriptures, and in the Writings of the
 more ancient Doctors of the Church, will be able to
 read those Acts of the *Pseudo-Synod* of *Nice*, without
 indignation and abhorrence of it, when he observes
 upon what ridiculous Fables, gross Misinterpretations
 of Scripture, Falsifications, and impertinent
 Allegations of the ancient Fathers, the Bishops of
 that Convention built their Decree concerning
 Image-Worship. Notwithstanding all this, the
 Bishops at *Trent* chose to follow that wretched
 Synod, and have decreed, and that as an Article
 of Faith, most firmly to be asserted, *that the Images
 of Christ and the Saints are to be retain'd, yea,
 and worship'd too.* May not one presume to ask
 why? What necessity is there of this? Cannot
 the Church of Christ

Christ be as well without these Images, and this Image-Worship *now*, as it was in the more ancient and purer Times of it? Nay, may we not farther ask, what good use *at all* can be made of these Images and this Image-Worship? The Answer of the Romanists here is, that these Images are *Libri Laicorum*, & *Idiotarum*, Books fit to instruct the Ignorant Laity that cannot read the Holy Scriptures, and apt to raise Devotion in them. But to this Plea for Image-Worship, made use of by *Wading* a Jesuit of *Antwerp*, his learned Antagonist returns this excellent Answer, with which I shall conclude what I have to say upon this Article: * “ I deny not but Images
 “ may be of use to the stupid Vulgar, who are
 “ led only by their Senses, for raising their Devo-
 “ tion at the sight of them; but see, I pray thee,
 “ whether many more and greater Disadvantages
 are

* *Non diffiteor imagines servire posse stupido vulgo, quod non nisi sensibus suis ducitur, ut earum conspectu ad devotionem excitetur, sed vide sis, obsecro, an non multo plura & graviora incommoda metuenda sint, ex usu & cultu earum. Primo enim, fieri vix potest, quin rude & profanum vulgus opiniones fœdas & sordidas de Deo Sanctisque imbibat, ut ex ipsis imaginibus & Statuis tanquam à Diis suis tutelaribus pendeat, in tribuat quæ Gentilium abominationibus paria sunt, si non deteriora; denique istarum imaginum tanquam librorum suorum usu prorsus obbrutescat, quasi aliud quid scire aut sapere opus non habeat. Confirmare hoc possem prolixè si luberet: sed experientiam solam teslem do, quæ omni exceptione major est. Secundo fieri non potest ut per imaginum usum ac cultum non gravissimè offendantur Judæi, & à Religione Christi amplectendâ reddantur alieniores: nimirum piaculum, scelus, aut flagitium summum penè ipsis est Statua aut Imaginis cultus. Messiam esse non posse firmissimè credunt, cujus discipuli tam directè contraria Divina legi licita esse sibi persuadent. Hoc malum tantò plurius æstimandum venit, quod præcipuum penè est, quod Judæorum bilem in Christum & Christianos acuit, adeo ut desperata mihi videatur eorum ad Christianam*

“ are not to be feared from the use and worship
 “ of them. For in the first place, it is scarce
 “ possible but that the ignorant and prophane
 “ Vulgar will be apt hence to imbibe filthy and
 “ sordid Notions of God and the Saints, will de-
 “ pend upon these Images and Statues as their
 “ Tutelar Gods, will pay them as bad or worse
 “ Adoration than the Heathens paid to their
 “ Abominations; and, lastly, will grow mere
 “ Brutes by using Images instead of Books, as
 “ if there were no need of understanding more
 “ than these will teach them. This, were it pro-
 “ per, might be abundantly confirmed: But I
 “ only appeal to Experience, as above all Ex-
 “ ception. In the next place, it cannot be but
 “ the *Jews* must be most intolerably scandalized
 “ at the use and worship of Images, and will be
 “ the more averse to all thoughts of ever em-
 “ embracing of Christianity, inasmuch as the wor-
 “ ship of a Statue or Image, is a dreadful, hein-
 “ ous, and enormous Crime with them. They
 “ most firmly believe, that he can never be the

Religionem conversio, quamdiu hic obex ipsis ponitur. Tertiò, fieri non potest, ut non offendatur, immò alienissimus non reddatur ab Ecclesiâ vestrâ, infinitus Christianorum numerus, qui solius interdicti divini Religione adducti, cultum Imaginum Idolatriam sibi esse persuadent: cum ii qui eum urgent, ex praecepto divino eum non credant necessarium esse, nihilominus tamen, quantâ possunt vi, eum tanquam necessarium, conscientiis imperant. Quanta hæc mala & incommoda sint quis non videt? Rudi populo datur causa manendi in profano suo stupore; Judæis in funesto ipsorum errore; Christianis in deplorando Schismate; piis omnibus in aternâ remedii desperatione. Anne hisce tot, tantisque incommodis una ista utilitas, quam ex imaginum usu cultuque percipi vis, æquipolleat, nedum præponderet, te ipsum judicem poscere non dubito. Episcopii Resp. ad Epist. Pet. Wadingi de cultu Imag. cap. 8.

“ *Messias,*

“ *Messias*, whose Disciples allow as lawful what
 “ is so directly contrary to the Divine Law. And
 “ this is to be reckoned so much the greater
 “ Evil, because it is almost the principal occasi-
 “ on of all the *Jews* indignation against Christ
 “ and Christians; so that their Conversion to
 “ our Religion is in my Opinion to be despaired
 “ of, unless this Stumbling-block be first taken
 “ out of the way. Thirdly, Offence will here-
 “ by be inevitably given to an infinite number
 “ of Christians, and they will be irreconcilably
 “ alienated from your Church, whilst having
 “ their Minds possessed with a true sense of
 “ the Divine Prohibition, they think they have
 “ just reason to look upon Image-Worship as no
 “ better than Idolatry: When also at the same
 “ time, those that contend for it do not believe
 “ it necessary by reason of any Divine Command,
 “ yet nevertheless press it as much as in them
 “ lies upon Mens Consciences, as though it were
 “ necessary. Who sees not what great Evils and
 “ Inconveniencies these are? The ignorant Peo-
 “ ple are tempted to continue in their pro-
 “ phane Sottishness; the *Jews* in their deltru-
 “ ctive Error; *Christians* in their deplorable
 “ Schism; and all good Men in an endless de-
 “ spair of ever seeing an Amendment. So that
 “ I need not fear to make thy self the Judge
 “ between us; and beg thee to tell me seriously,
 “ whether the single advantage of using and wor-
 “ shipping Images will equal, not to say prepon-
 “ derate, these so many and so great Mischiefs.

The next Article is concerning Papal Indulgen-
 ces, in these words: † “ I also affirm, that the

† *Indulgentiarum etiam potestatem à Christo in Ecclesia re-*
lictam fuisse, illarumque usum Christiano populo, maxime saluta-
rem esse affirmo.

power of granting Indulgences was left by Christ to the Church, and the use of them tends very much to the Salvation of Christians. Now the Doctrine of Indulgences, as it was before the Council of Trent, and hath been since taught in the Church of Rome, is big with gross Errors. It depends on the Fiction of Purgatory; it supposeth a superfluity of the Satisfaction of the Saints; which being jumbled together, (*horreo referens*,) with the Merits and Satisfaction of our Saviour, make up one Treasury of the Church; that the Bishop of Rome keeps the Key of it, as having the sole power of granting Indulgences, either by himself immediately, or by others commission'd from him: Lastly, it very absurdly extends the effect of the power of the Keys, left by Christ in his Church, to men in the other World. Is not this now a Doctrine worthy of a place in our Creed, and to be made an Article of the Catholick Faith? That the Doctrine and Use of Indulgences were never heard of in the Church of Christ for many hundreds of Years, is certain, and confessed too by divers learned Men of the Roman Communion. I shall cite only one of them, but he such a one as may be *instar omnium*. Our *Roffensis*, Luther's great Antagonist, and Rome's Martyr, gives us this Account of Indulgences: "† Many perhaps are tempted not to rely much upon Indulgences, upon this consideration, that the use of them appears to be new, and very lately known amongst Christians. To whom
" I an-

† Multos fortasse movet indulgentiis non multum fidere quod earum usus in Ecclesia videatur fuisse recentior, & admodum serò repertus apud Christianos. Quibus ego respondeo, non certo

" I answer, It is not very certain who was the
 " first Author of them. The Doctrine of Purga-
 " tory was rarely, if at all, heard of amongst the
 " Ancients. And to this very Day, the *Greeks*
 " believe it not. Nor was the belief either of
 " Purgatory or Indulgences so necessary in the
 " Primitive Church as it is now. So long as
 " Men were unconcerned about Purgatory, no
 " body enquired after Indulgences: For upon
 " that depends all the worth of Indulgences.
 " Take away Purgatory, and there is no more
 " need of these. Seeing therefore Purgatory was
 " so lately known, and received in the universal
 " Church, who will wonder that in the first
 " Ages of Christianity Indulgences were not made
 " use of?

In this indeed the Bishop seems to be mistaken,
 that he thought the Doctrine of Purgatory and
 the Use of Indulgences to be coeval, and that
 the latter immediately and necessarily follows
 from the former. It is true, Purgatory and Pa-
 pal Indulgences are both of them later Inven-
 tions. But I think, when Men were first seduced
 to a belief of Purgatory, they were not yet pre-
 sently so foolish, as to think that any one mortal

*certo constare à quo primum tradi ceperunt. De Purgatorio apud
 priscos, nulla vel rarissima fiebat mentio. Sed & Græcis ad hunc
 usque diem, non est creditum Purgatorium esse. Nec tam necessa-
 ria fuit sive Purgatorii sive indulgentiarum fides in Primitivâ
 Ecclesiâ atque nunc est. Quamdiu nulla fuerat, de Purgatorio cu-
 ra, nemo quesivit indulgentias. Nam ex illo pendet omnis In-
 dulgentiarum existimatio. Si tollas Purgatorium, quorsum indul-
 gentiis opus erit? Quum itaque Purgatorium, tam sero cognitum,
 ac receptum fuerit universa Ecclesiâ, quis jam de indulgentiis
 mirari potest, quod in principio nascentis Ecclesiâ nullus fuerit
 earum usus? Act. 18. cont. Lutherum.*

Man had power by his Pardons to deliver Men out of it. Antichristianism in the Roman Church did not presently come to that maturity, nor was the Papal Power so soon advanced to that prodigious height and greatness. It was at first more reasonably judged, that the supposed miserable Souls in Purgatory, were to receive their relief, rather from the Prayers of the Church, together with the Prayers, Almsdeeds, and good Works of their living Friends and Relations.

To sum up this matter in short: Papal Indulgences, as taught and used in the Church of *Rome*, (to which this Article of the *Trent* Creed must have reference; or else let any Man tell me, what the meaning of it is) if they were freely granted, can by no means be justified and defended, but the merchandise and sale of them for Money is abominable. That such a vile trade of Indulgences hath been driven in the Church of *Rome*, cannot without the greatest impudence be denied, as long as the *Taxa* † *Cancellaria Apostolica* is extant. Of which filthy Book *Espencaus* a learned Doctor of the Roman Communion, thus sadly and most justly complains in *Epist. ad Tit. c. 1.* " There ‡ is exposed to sale, and easily
" to be had by any who will be at the charge of
" purchasing it, a Book openly and publickly
" printed here, and which may be had now as
" well as formerly, entituled *The Tax of the*
" *Apostolical Chamber or Chancery*, whereby may
" be

† *Taxa Cancell. Apost. Paris. apud Tass. Denis. 1520.*

‡ *Prostat & in questu pro meretrice sedet liber palam ac publicè hic impressus, & hodieque ut olim, venalis, Taxa Camera seu Cancellaria Apostolica inscriptus, in quo plus scelerum discas licet, quam in omnibus omnium vitiorum summis & summaris;*
 &

" be learned more sorts of Wickedness, than from
 " all the Summits and the Summaries of all Vi-
 " ces, and a licence for most of them, but an ab-
 " solution for all, is offered to such as will bid
 " well for it. I spare names, for as one though
 " at present I cannot well recollect who, says,
 " the very repeating of them is offensive. It is
 " wonderful that during this time and this Schism,
 " such an infamous kind of Index of so ma-
 " ny, such foul and horrid Wickednesses, that I
 " cannot imagine any more scandalous work is to
 " be met with in *Germany*, or *Suitzerland*, or
 " any of those Countries that have withdrawn
 " their obedience to the Papal See, should not
 " have been suppressed. So far have the Factors
 " from the Roman Communion been from sup-
 " pressing it, that many new Impunities for such
 " so gross Enormities are granted, and the rest
 " confirmed, in the Faculties of the Legates di-
 " spatched to their several Countries. A little
 after he adds out of *Mantuan*, " 'Tis || sad to see
 " how Mony carries all things at *Rome*. And
 not very long before the Council of *Trent* what
 a prodigious mass of Mony Pope *Leo* raised by
 these Indulgences, the noble Historian *Thuanus*

& plurimis quidem licentia, omnibus autem absolutio empturienti-
 bus proposita; parco nominibus, nam quod ait nescio quis

Nomina sunt ipso, penè timenda sono,

Mirum hoc tempore, hoc schismate non suppressum tot tamque fœ-
 dorum tamque horrendorum scelerum velut indicem adeo infamem,
 ut non putem in *Germaniâ*, *Helvetiâ*, & ubicunque a Romanâ sede
 defectum est opus proflare majore hujus scandalo; adeo tamen non
 supprimitur ab Ecclesia Romana favissoribus, ut talium ac tanto-
 rum facinorum impunitates, in facultatibus Legatorum illinc huc
 venientium, bona ex parte innoventur atque consumentur.

|| Heu *Romæ* nunc sola Pecunia regnat, Mant. Ecl. 9.

tells

tells us: "Leo,* saith he to the guilt of his Dispensations, added another and greater, when at the instigation of the Cardinal *Laurence Picus*, he every where exacted Monys in vast Sums, sending his Bulls through all the Kindoms of Christendom, promising forgiveness of all their Sins, and eternal Life, at a price stated according to the quality of their Crimes.

In a word, all sober Men cry'd shame at this abominable Cheat, imposed on the Souls of Men for whom Christ dyed. And if the Men that influenced and govern'd the *Trent* Convention, had had any true sense of Religion, they would have denounced an Anathema against this vile Doctrine and Practice, and not (as they have done) decreed, and that as an Article of Faith without any restriction or qualification, "That || the use of Indulgences is highly conducing to the Salvation of Christians. But they were the Pope's Vassals, and received their Instructions from *Rome* not to reform any thing, tho' never so much amiss, that tended to the Grandeur and Gain of that See.

The last Article I shall take notice of is contained in these words: "I † acknowledge the "holy Catholick and Apostolick Roman Church

* *Peccatum, in sacris muneribus dispensandis Leo gravitate cumulavit, cum Laurentii Picii Cardinalis impulsu, pecuniam ad immensos Sumptus undique corrogaret, missis per omnia Christiani orbis regna diplomatibus, quibus omnium delictorum expiationem ac vitam eternum pollicitus est constituto pretio, quod quisque pro peccati gravitate dependerit. Jac. Thuan. Histor. sui temporis ad ann. 1515.*

|| *Indulgentiarum usum Christiano populo maxime salutare esse.*

† *Sanctam Catholicam & Apostolicam Romanam Eccl. omnium Ecclesiarum Matrem & Magistram agnosco, Romano Pontifici, Beati Petri, Apostolorum Principis, Successori, ac Jesu Christi Vicario veram obedientiam spondeo.*

" to

“ to be the Mother and Mistress of all Churches,
 “ and promise true obedience to the Pope of Rome;
 “ Successor to St. Peter the Prince of the Apostles,
 “ and the Vicar of Jesus Christ. Here the Eccle-
 siastick swears to three great untruths one upon
 the neck of another. 1. *That the Roman Church is*
the Mother of all other Churches; which is a ma-
 nifest falshood in matter of Fact. For every bo-
 dy knows, that the Church of *Jerusalem* was
 the first Mother Church, and is so called and ac-
 knowledged by the ancient Fathers. St. *Jerome*
 saith, “ It † was the Church founded at *Jerusa-*
lem, that planted all the other Churches. And
 the Synodical Letters from the Council of *Con-*
stantinople to *Damasus*, and the Western Bishops
 calls *Cyriel Bishop of Jerusalem*, which || is the
Mother of all Churches. From this truly Mother
 Church divers other Churches were planted in the
East, before the Gospel came to *Rome*; as parti-
 cularly the Church of * *Antioch*, where the Dis-
 ciples were first called Christians. Upon the Per-
 secution raised against the Church of *Jerusalem*,
 the Christians of that Church being disperfed and
 scattered abroad, soon spread the Gospel far and
 near through the *East*. And to come nearer home,
 it is affirmed by some learned Men of the Roman
 Church that our *Britain* receiv'd the Gospel be-
 fore *Rome*. For † *Suarez* confesseth that the Go-
 spel was preached here from the first rising of it.
 And *Baronius* from some MSS. in the *Vatican*
 affixeth our Conversion to Christianity to the 35th

‡ *Ecclesia in Hierusalem fundata totius orbis Ecclesias semi-*
navit. Com. in *Is.* 2.

|| *Τῆς μὲν πρώτης ἀπαρχῆς ἐκκλησιῶν, Theodoret, Eccl. Histor.*
l. 5. c. 9.

* *Act. 11. 26.*

† *Defens. Fid. Cath. l. 4.*

Year of our Lord, which was near nine Years before the founding of the Roman Church. But if the credit of these MSS. be questionable, this however is evident, that our *Britain* did not receive her first Christianity from *Rome*, but from the *East*. This, I say, is evident from the Customs observed here from the beginning in the observation of *Easter*, and the administration of Baptism, different from the Roman use, but conform to the Oriental Churches. So that we may justly check the arrogance of the present Roman Church in the words of St. *Paul* to the proud *Corinthians*, setting up among themselves certain Customs, contrary to the Institutes of all other Churches. *Came ‡ the word of God out from you? Or came it to you only?* Q. d. Are you the first and only Christians? Your Church the first and only Church of Christ? Yes say the Romanists our Church is the Mother of all other Churches. But this is apparently false, *for the Law first came out of Sion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem*. The Church of *Rome* pretends also to be the only Church of Christ, *i. e.* that there is no true Church of Christ but what is in union with and subjection to her. But this is as false a claim as the other. For there were diverse true Churches of Christ, before the Church of *Rome* was in being, which therefore could have no dependence upon her.

2. *That the Church of Rome is the Mistress of all other Churches* is another great Untruth. A proposition which if it should have been advanced in the first Ages of the Church, would have startled all Christendom. Every metropolitical Church would presently have stood up, and loud-

‡ 1 Cor 14. 36.

ly pleaded her own Immunities, Rights and Privileges independent upon *Rome*, or any other Metropolis. These Rights and Privileges were confirm'd as of primitive and ancient Custom by the 6th *Canon* of the great Council of *Nice*, as hath been before shewn; established also by the 8th *Canon* of the Oecumenical Council of *Ephesus*, as by and by will appear. Indeed in the days of old, when the Church of *Rome* was quite another thing from what now it is, all other Churches upn several accounts, paid a singular respect to her, and gave her the preeminence; but they never acknowledged her Mistresship over them, or themselves to be her Serving-Maids. This Language would then have sounded very harsh, and been esteem'd insolent and arrogant by all the Churches of Christ. In later days indeed she hath made her self Mistress, but a Mistress of misrule, disturbing the Peace, invading the Rights, and imposing upon the Faith of other Churches.

3. *That the Bishop of Rome is the Vicar of Christ*, i. e. under Christ the Head and Governor of the Universal Church is another gross untruth. The Universal Pastorship and Jurisdiction of the Bishop of *Rome*, over all other Bishops was never heard of, never pretended to by any Bishop of that Church for the first six hundred Years and more, as I have before shewn. To which all that I shall now add concerns our *British* Church. We say then, our Church of *Britain* was never under the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of *Rome* for the first six hundred Years; *Britain* being a distinct Diocese of the Empire, and consequently having a Primate of her own, independent upon any other Primate or Metropolitan. This appears first from the Customs of our Church during that time, in the observation
of

of *Easter*, and the administration of Baptism, different from, as was before observ'd, the Roman Custom, but agreeing with the *Asiatick* Churches. For it is altogether incredible that the whole *British* Church should so unanimously have dissented from *Rome* for so many hundred Years together, if she had been subject to the Jurisdiction of the Roman Bishop, or that the Roman Bishop all that time should suffer it, if he had had a Patriarchal Power over her.

2. The same is evident by the unanimous Testimony of our Historians, who tell us that when *Austin* the Monk came into *Britain*, as *St. Gregory's* Legate (which was after the 6th Century was fully compleat and ended) and required submission from our Church to the Bishop of *Rome*, as her Patriarch, the proposal was rejected, as of a new and strange thing never heard of before. The answer of *Dinotus*, the learned Abbot of *Bangor*, in the name of all the *Britons* is famous, viz. "That they knew no obedience due to him, "whom they call'd the Pope, but the obedience "of Love, and that under God they were govern'd by the Bishop of *Caerleon*. Under God, *i. e.* immediately, without any foreign Prelate or Patriarch intervening, they were to be govern'd by the Bishop of *Caerleon*, as their only Primate and Patriarch. Which privilege continued to the succeeding Bishops of that See for several Ages, saving that the Archiepiscopal Chair was afterwards removed from *Caerleon* to *St. Davids*. And that this was indeed the sense not only of *Dinotus*, but of all the whole Body of our *British* Clergy at that time, all our Historians tell us, witnessing the absolute and unanimous resolution of the *British* Clergy, both Bishops and Priests, synodically met together, not to subject themselves

selves to the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome.
*Vide. Spel. Com. Gual. Mon. l. 2. c. 12. Bedam
 omnesque alios.*

This being the antient privilege of the *British* Church, we have an undoubted right of exemption from the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome by the ancient Canons of the Catholick Church: Particularly by the sixth Canon of the great *Nicene* Council above-mentioned, by which it was decreed, *That the ancient Customs should every where obtain, and that the then privileges of every Province should be preserved inviolate.* But this is most evident from the eighth Canon of the Council of *Ephesus*, occasioned by the famous case of the *Cyprian* Bishops, which was this: The Metropolitan of *Cyprus* being dead, (*Troilus* the Bishop of *Constance*,) the Bishop of *Antioch* pretended that it belonged to him to ordain their Metropolitan, because *Cyprus* was within the Civil Jurisdiction of the Diocese of *Antioch*. Upon this, the *Cyprian* Bishops made their complaint to the General Council at *Ephesus*, grounding it upon the *Nicene* Canon, and pleading that their Metropolitan had been of ancient time exempt from the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of *Antioch*, and was ordain'd by a Synod of *Cyprian* Bishops: Which privilege was not only confirm'd to them by the *Ephesine* Council, but a General Decree passed, *That the Rights of every Province should be preserved whole and inviolate, which it had of old, according to the ancient custom.* And it is to be observed, that the Bishop of *Antioch* had a more colourable pretence to a Jurisdiction over the *Cyprian* Bishops, than *Gregory* could have to a Jurisdiction over our *British* Churches: For *Cyprus* was indeed within the Civil Jurisdiction of *Antioch*, but our *Britain* was originally it self
 a di-

a distinct Diocese of the Empire. Yet the *Ephesine* Fathers judged, that ancient custom should prevail in the case of the *Cyprian* Bishops; how much more then should it in ours? Certainly Pope *Gregory*, when by his Legate *Austin* he challeng'd to himself a Jurisdiction over our *British Church*, was ignorant of, or had forgotten, or else regarded not the Canons of the *Nicene* and *Ephesine* Councils. If it be objected, that our *British Church* afterwards submitted her self to the Bishop of *Rome* as her Patriarch, which Power he enjoyed for many Ages, and that therefore our first Reformers cannot be excused from Schism, in casting off that Power which by so long a prescription he was possess'd of; we answer, we did indeed yield our selves to the *Roman* Usurpation, but it was because we could not help it; we were at first forced, awed, and affrighted into this Submission. For, who hath not heard of the barbarous Massacre of the poor innocent Monks of *Bangor*, to the number of Twelve hundred, for refusing *Austin's* Proposal, and asserting the ancient Rights and Privileges of the *Britanick* Churches? When this Force ceased, and we were left to our liberty and freedom of resuming our Primitive Rights, why might we not do it, as we saw occasion, without the imputation of Schism? This is not only our just Plea, but it is ingenuously confessed by Father *Barns*, our learned Countryman, and of the *Roman* Communion. His words are these: ‡ " The

‡ *Insula autem Britannia gavisæ est olim privilegio Cyprio, ut nullius Patriarchæ legibus subderetur. Hoc autem privilegium etsi abolitum olim fuit bellorum tumultibus & vi, tamen cum in tempore Henrici Octavi totius Regni consensu fuerit repetitum; videtur Pacis ergo retineri debere, sine dispendio Catholicismi, & absq; Schismatis ullius notâ. Barns. Cath. Rom. Pacif. Sect. 3.*

" Island

" Island of *Britain* anciently enjoyed the same
 " privilege with that of *Cyprus*, that is to say,
 " of being in subjection to the Laws of no Pa-
 " triarch: Which Privilege, though heretofore
 " abolished by Tumults and Force of War, yet
 " being recovered by consent of the whole King-
 " dom in *Henry* the Eighth's Reign, seems for
 " Peace-sake most proper to be retained, so it be
 " done without breach of Catholick Unity, or
 " incurring the charge of Schism. Indeed, we had
 very great reason to resume our Primitive Right,
 and Privilege of Exemption from the Jurisdic-
 tion of the Bishop of *Rome*, when by means there-
 of he Lorded it over our Faith, and imposed ma-
 nifest and gross Corruptions both in Doctrine and
 Worship upon our Consciences. But this by the
 way. We return to the Article of the *Trent*
 Creed now before us.

Concerning which it is farther to be observed,
 that it founds the universal Pastorship of the Bi-
 shop of *Rome* upon a *Divine Right*. It says, the
Bishop of Rome is the Vicar of Jesus Christ; i. e.
 under Christ the Head and Governour of the
 universal Church. *Quo jure?* He is *St. Peter's*
Successor. What then? Why, *St. Peter* was
 constituted by Christ the Prince of the Apostles,
 i. e. (if there be any connexion of Parts in the
 Article,) he had by Christ committed to him
 Authority and Jurisdiction over the rest of the
 Apostles, and consequently over the whole Church.

But the falshood and folly of this pretence,
 hath been manifestly exposed by very many || Wri-
 ters of our Church: Particularly, that great
 Man *Dr. Bramhall*, Primate of *Ireland*, hath suf-

ficiently refuted it in these few words. " Let
 " us consider, saith he,

" *First*, That all the Twelve Apostles were
 " equal in Mission, equal in Commission, equal
 " in Power, equal in Honour, equal in all things,
 " except priority of Order, without which no So-
 " ciety can well subsist.

" So much * *Bellarmin* confesseth, that by
 " these words, *As my Father sent me, so send I*
 " *you*, our Saviour endowed them with all the
 " fulness of Power that mortal Men were ca-
 " pable of. And therefore no single Apostle had
 " Jurisdiction over the rest, † *Equals have no*
 " *power over each other*; but the whole College
 " of Apostles, to which the supreme Manegery
 " of Ecclesiastical Affairs did belong in common;
 " Whether a new Apostle was to be ordain'd;
 " or the Office of Deaconship was to be ere-
 " cted; or fit Persons were to be delegated for
 " the ordering of the Church, as † *Peter* and
 " *John, Judas and Silas*; or Informations of
 " great moment were to be heard, as against
 " *Peter* himself? (tho' *Peter* out of modesty
 " might condescend, and submit to that to which
 " he was not obliged in Duty; yet it had not
 " become the other Apostles to sit as Judges
 " upon their Superior, placed over them by
 " Christ;) or whether the weightier Questions,
 " of the calling of the Gentiles, and Circum-
 " cision, and the Law of *Moses*, were to be de-
 " termin'd? still we find the Supremacy in the
 " College.

" *Secondly*, That drowsie Dream, that the

* Bell. de Pont. l. 4. c. 22.

† *Par in parem non habet potestatem.*

† Acts 1. Acts 6. Acts 8, and 15. Acts 11. Acts 15.

" plenitude

" plenitude of Ecclesiastical Power and Jurisdi-
 " ction was given by Christ to St. Peter, as to
 " an ordinary Pastor, to be derived from him to
 " his Successors, but to the rest of the Apostles,
 " as Delegates for term of Life, to die with
 " themselves, as it is lately and boldly asserted,
 " without Reason, without Authority either Di-
 " vine or Humane; so it is most repugnant to
 " the Doctrine of the Fathers, who make all
 " Bishops to be the Vicars and Embassadors of
 " Christ, (not of the Pope,) and Successors of
 " the Apostles, indifferently *Vicaria Ordinatione*,
 " who make but one Episcopacy in the World,
 " whereof every Bishop hath his share. St.
 " Peter was a Pastor, and the Pastoral Office is
 " of perpetual necessity in the Church. True;
 " but so were all the rest of the Apostles Pastors
 " as well as he. And if we examine the mat-
 " ter more narrowly, *cui bono*? For whose ad-
 " vantage this Distinction was devised? It was
 " not for St. Peter's own advantage, who set-
 " ting aside his Principality of Order; is con-
 " fessed to have had but an equal share of
 " Power with his Fellow Apostles, but for the
 " Pope's Advantage, and the Roman Court's,
 " whom they desire to invest, solely with the
 " Key of all Original Jurisdiction.

" And if we trace on this Argument a little
 " farther, to search out how the Bishop of
 " Rome comes to be St. Peter's Heir, *ex asse*, to
 " the exclusion of his elder Brother the Bishop
 " of *Antioch*, they produce no Authority that I
 " have seen, but a blind, ill-grounded Legend,
 " out of a counterfeit *Hegeſippus*, of St. Pe-
 " ter's being about to leave Rome, and Christ's
 " meeting him upon the way, and admonishing
 " him to return to Rome, where he must be cru-

“ eified for his Name; which Reason halts on
 “ both sides; the Foundation is Apocryphal,
 “ and the Superstructure is weak and unjointed,
 “ without any necessary connexion.

We have now, I think, sufficiently made good our second Charge against the Church of Rome, *Viz. That she hath changed the Primitive Canon and Rule of Faith, by adding many new Articles to it; and those so far from being necessary Articles of Faith, that they are not Truths, but manifestly erroneous Propositions, repugnant to Reason, Scripture, and the sense of the Primitive Catholick Church.* And yet all the Clergy of the Roman Communion are now forced not only to subscribe, but in the most solemn manner to swear to them. O miserably enslaved Clergy!

There was a time when the Gallican Church understood her own Liberty, and boldly asserted it, refusing to own the Authority of the Trent Convention, as being altogether influenced and govern'd by the Court of Rome. 'Twas a brave Protestation of the Ambassador of France, made in the face of the Council of Trent, in the Name of the King his Master, and the French Clergy, in these words: * *We refuse to be subject to the Command and Disposition of Pius the Fourth; we reject, refuse, and condemn all the Judgments, Censures, and Decrees of the said Pius. And although (most holy Fathers,) your Religion, Life and Learning, was ever, and ever shall be of great esteem with us; yet seeing indeed you do nothing, but all things are done at Rome rather than at Trent, and the things that are here publish'd, are rather the Decrees of Pius the Fourth than of the Council of Trent; we denounce and protest here before you all, that whatsoever things*

* Goldast. Tom. 3. p. 571.

are decreed and publish'd in this Assembly, by the meer Will and Pleasure of Pius, neither the most Christian King will ever approve, nor the French Clergy ever acknowledge to be the Decrees of a General Council.

I wish the Gallican Church had still persisted in this Resolution: Yes, (saith a † great Man of our Church,) so she did, and doth to this Day. [For tho' she doth not oppose the Council of Trent, but acquiesce, to avoid such Disadvantages as must ensue thereupon, yet she did never admit it.] I should be heartily glad if this were true; but if all the Clergy of France, which represent the French Church, do as well as the Clergy of the other Roman Catholick Dominions, subscribe and swear to the Trent Creed, (as I suppose they do; and if they did not, I cannot see how they could be accounted within the Communion of the Roman Church;) then they admit of the Council of Trent with a witness, in its full Extent and Latitude, as to all its Canons, Decrees, and Definitions, not only which concern Points of Doctrine, (as is pretended,) but all other which relate to the Discipline and Government of the Church. For this is the last Article of the Trent Creed: * "Moreover, what things soever else are delivered, defined, and declared by the Sacred Canons and Oecumenical Councils, and especially by the holy Council of Trent, I undoubtedly receive and profess.

† Bramhall's just Vindication. Tom. I. p. 128.

* *Cetera item omnia à Sacris Canonibus & Oecumenicis Conciliis, ac præcipuè à Sacrosancta Tridentinâ Synodo tradita, definita, & declarata, indubitanter recipio atque profiteor.*

SECT. IV. 3. The third and last thing we charge the Church of Rome with, is, *That she hath lamentably corrupted the Primitive Liturgy, and Form of Divine Worship.* This was a necessary consequent of the former; so corrupt a Faith could not but produce as corrupt a Worship. To enumerate and represent in their proper Colours, all the Corruptions of the Worship of God in the Roman Church would fill a large Volume. I shall therefore only briefly point at some of them. The Prayers of that Church are in a Tongue generally not understood by the People, contrary to Reason, which of it self dictates, that when we pray to God we ought to understand our own Prayers; contrary to the plain Declaration of Scripture, 1 Cor. 14. contrary to the Practice of the Catholick Church in the first Ages, when Christians every where prayed to God in the Language of their respective Countries, as *Origen* expressly tells us in his Eighth Book against *Celsus*, p. 402. *Justin Martyr* also, who lived very near the Apostolick Age, informs us, That in the Christian Assemblies of his time, there were *Koinai Euxai*, Common Prayers, i. e. Prayers wherein all that were present, joined in common, and bore a part; and that (as we learn from other very ancient* Authors,) by making their *Responses* aloud in due place, and by saying the other Prayer after the Priest or Deacon, *Submissa voce*. Now there are no such Common Prayers in the Church of Rome, the Priests say and do all; the People being left to gaze about, or to whisper one to another, or to

* *Vide* Cyprian, Serm. de Oratione.

look upon their private Manuals of Devotion, according as their inclination leads them.

Again, whereas in the first and best Ages, the Churches of Christ directed all their Prayers, according to the Scripture, to God only through the alone mediation of Jesus Christ: The Liturgy of the present Church of *Rome*, is interspersed with Supplications and Prayers to Angels and Saints, the unwarrantableness whereof I have above sufficiently shewn. To what is there said, I shall only add these two Considerations.

1st, Supposing (not granting) the learned Men of the Roman Church could by their subtle Distinctions so refine the Practice of the Invocation of Angels and Saints, as to make it innocent to themselves; yet Experience tells us, that the common People, who understand not those Distinctions, are prone to transgress, and run into sin, and a grievous sin too, in their Practice of it, *viz.* to be taken off in a great degree from that trust and affiance, that entire dependence on Christ, that love and gratitude toward him which they ought to have, and indeed to be more fond of the Saints than of their Saviour. It is visible to all Men, with what zeal the silly deluded Souls run to the Shrines of the Saints, how even prodigal they are in their Offerings to them, when in the mean time their Devotion toward their Saviour is very cold, and their Oblations to him sparing and niggardly. This is so manifest, that it hath been confess'd by learned Men of the Roman Communion. It is acknowledged by *Biel*, in *Can. Miss. Lett.* 30. in *Expos. Cant. Mariæ*, " * Most of us are more affected to-

* *Plerique nostram magis afficimur circa Sanctum aliquem aliquando, quam etiam circa Dominum,*

“wards some Saint, than towards our Lord
 “himself. By our *Halensis*, Par. 4. *Quæst.* 26.
Memb. 3. “† Sometimes Sinners are more in-
 “incluable to supplicate the Saints, than the
 “Judge. *Cassander* also confesseth, there are
 Men in the Church of *Rome*, (otherwise no ill
 Men,) who trust in their Patron Saints more
 than in Christ their Redeemer. His words are
 these: “|| There are some, and those no bad
 “Men neither, who have made choice of cer-
 “tain Saints for their Patrons and Guardians,
 “and put more trust in their Merits and Inter-
 “cession than in the Merits of Christ.

2dly, Whereas it is pretended by some Roma-
 nists, especially of late, that their Prayers to
 Saints amount to no more than an *Ora pro nobis*,
 a praying, or desiring them to pray for us, as we
 desire the Prayers of one another here on Earth;
 this is manifestly false. For besides what hath
 been before observed, that they pray to Saints
 deceased, and in a state and place vastly distant
 from them, wherein they cannot possibly hear
 their Prayers, unless by Revelation, or in *Speculo*
Trinitatis, which are groundless imaginations;
 I say besides this, divers of their greatest Doctors
 ingenuously confess, yea, and boldly profess, that
 they pray to the Saints, as they are appointed by
 God to be *canales gratiæ*, between him and us;
 Conduit-pipes or Instruments of conveying his
 Grace to us. So our *Halensis*: “† Seeing the

† *Peccatores ad Sanctorum interpellationem quandoque magis
 animantur, quam iudicis.*

|| *Homines etiam non mali certos sibi Sanctos tanquam Patronos
 & Tutores delegerunt, atque in eorum meritis atque intercessione,
 plusquam Christi meritis fiduciam posuerunt.*

† *Divinorum Charismatum ad nos per Sanctos fit descensus:
 unde Congruum est, quod ascensus noster ad Deum fiat Sanctis me-
 diatoribus.* Part 4. *Quæst.* 26. Art. 5.

“ Divine

“ Divine Grace descends upon us by means of
 “ the Saints, it is but fit that our ascent to God
 “ be through their Mediation. So their learned
 Archbishop of *Florence*: “ It † is the Law of the
 “ Deity to raise the things below to those that
 “ are above, by those in the middle; but as to
 “ the gifts of Grace, the Saints stand in the mid-
 “ dle betwixt God and such as are travelling to-
 “ wards him. Hence the divine Benefits descend
 “ upon us by the mediation of Angels and holy
 “ Souls. They say also, that the Saints do pro-
 cure for us, and convey to us God’s Blessings by
 the merit of their intercession, and that this is
 the ground of their praying to them. So again
ubi supra: “ The ‡ Saints are invoked by us by
 “ reason of our want of merit, that where our
 “ defects fail, those of others may help us out.
 So the great Master of the Sentences, *Peter Lom-
 bard*: “ We || pray them to intercede for us,
 “ that is, that their merits may succour us.

And indeed most of their Prayers to the Saints
 are so expressed, that they cannot without vio-
 lence be interpreted to any other sense.

But most extravagant is the invocation and wor-
 ship of the Blessed Virgin, used and practised in
 the Church of *Rome*. I will not urge here the
 Hymn in *Cassander*’s * time sung in their Churches;

† Lex Deitatis est infima per media ad suprema adducere;
 Quantum vero ad dona gratia, Beati sunt medii inter Deum &
 Viatores; divina igitur beneficia ad nos descendunt mediantibus
 Angelis & animabus sanctis, part. 3. tit. 3.

‡ Sancti invocantur à nobis, propter nostram inopiam in meren-
 do, ut, ubi nostra non suppetant merita, patrocinentur aliena.

|| Oramus ut intercedant pro nobis, id est, ut merita eorum nobis
 suffragentur, Lib. 4. Dist. 45.

* *Cassand. Consult. Art. 21. de Cult. sanct.*

“ Beseech

“ Beseech || thy Mother, command thy Son, O
 “ happy Parent, Who makest expiation for our
 “ Wickedness, By thy Authority as a Mother
 “ command the Redeemer. Nor the Psalter of
 our Lady, mentioned also by *Cassander* *, as that
 which was in use in his time, in which through
 the whole Book of Psalms, wheresoever the name
 of the Lord occur'd, it was changed into the
 name of our Lady. Tho' I know not whether
 those horrid blasphemies were ever censured and
 condemned by any publick act of the Roman
 Church.

But I do affirm, that there are still such ad-
 dresses and forms of Prayer to the blessed Virgin,
 either enjoyn'd, or allow'd by Authority to be
 used in the Church of *Rome*, as no Man, who
 hath a due concern for the honour of his Re-
 deemer, can read or hear without abhorrence and
 detestation: Such is that, “ In † the Office of
 “ Blessed *Mary*, where they thus speak to her:
 “ Hail ‡ Queen, the Mother of Mercy, our Life,
 “ Delight, and Hope, hail; we shelter our selves
 “ under thy protection, despise not our supplica-
 “ tions in the times of our necessity; but deliver
 “ us from all dangers, thou ever glorious Virgin.
 This is surely more than a *Pray || for us*. For
 they pray unto her as their Life and Hope, and
 fly to her as their Refuge and Protection, be-
 seeching her to deliver them always from all dan-
 gers: But chiefly it is to be remark'd that she

|| *Ora Matrem jube Filio,* | *Nostra pians scelera,*
O felix puerpera, | *Jure Matris impera Redemptori.*
 * *Cassand. ibid.* † *In Officio Beata Maria.*
 ‡ *Salve Regina Mater misericordiae, vita, dulcedo, & spes*
nostra, salve; sub tuum praesidium confugimus nostras deprecationes
ne despicias in necessitatibus: Sed a periculis omnibus libera nos
semper Virgo gloriosa. || *Ora pro nobis.*

is here called the *Queen and Mother of Mercy*. Would you know the meaning of this? *Berthorinus* will tell you: "The† truth is, whereas the " Kingdom of God consists in these two Vertues, " Justice and Mercy, God bestow'd on *Mary*, " the Queen of Paradise, the half part of his " Kingdom, that is, the Mercy. And for this " cause it is she is called the Mother of Mercy. The same exposition you may find in *Biel* ‡. And *Cassander* also acknowledgeth this to be the sense of that title given to the Blessed Virgin.

In the Litany of our Lady published in English here among us, she is called " Queen of Angels, " Patriarchs, Prophets and Apostles, source of " the fountain of Grace, Refuge of Sinners, Com- " fort of the Afflicted, and Advocate of all Chri- " tians. Now we have no instance of such Attri- butes given to the Blessed Virgin, either in the holy Scriptures, or in the Writings of the ancient Fathers; and indeed they are too big for any mere Creature. For here the Government of Heaven, and all the holy Angels therein, is attributed to her, which belongs only to our Lord Christ ||. And what do they mean by that title which they give her of *Source* (*Scaturigo*) of the Fountain of Grace? I cannot imagine any other meaning of it, than this, that the Virgin *Mary* receiving first the emanation or efflux of Grace, from God the Fountain of Grace, by and through her, all Grace is carried and conveyed

† *Ista est veritas, quod cum Regnum Dei in duobus constet; scil. in justitiâ & misericordiâ, isti Regina Paradisi (Maria) dimidiam Regni sui partem, scil. misericordiæ distributionem contulit Deus. Igitur Regina discitur Misericordia, lib. 19. Moralitarum, cap. 4.* ‡ *In Can. Missæ. Lect. 8.*

|| *Eph. 1. 20, 21, 22.*

down to all the Faithful. And so indeed *Bernardinus* explains the matter in these words:
 "No * Creature has obtained any Grace or Vertue
 "from God, but by the dispensation of this pious
 "Mother. They that under this Notion address
 themselves to the Blessed Virgin, surely do much
 more than desire her to pray for them, as we de-
 sire the Prayers of one another.

What do they mean when they say she is the
 Refuge of Sinners? From what hath been said
 before, concerning the Kingdom of Mercy, sup-
 posed to be committed to the Blessed Virgin, and
 concerning the title of Queen of Mercy given
 her, we may conclude the sense to be this, that
 when Sinners are troubled in their Consciences,
 and terrified with the sense of their Sins, and of
 the Judgments of God denounced against them,
 they may and ought to have recourse to her, as
 the Queen of Mercy, as their *Asylum* and San-
 ctuary to shelter and protect them from the di-
 vine Vengeance. This a credible Author assures
 us, hath been represented in several Roman Ca-
 tholick Temples, in which Christ hath been paint-
 ed with an angry menacing Countenance, casting
 his darts against Sinners, and the Blessed Virgin
 interposing her self as Mediatrix and repelling his
 Darts. But Christ our Lord directs poor guilty
 Sinners, whose Consciences are oppressed with
 the burthen of their Sins, to a far better Refuge,
 yea the only Refuge they are to fly to, even to
 himself. *Come † unto me, all ye that labour and
 are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.*

* *Nulla Creatura aliquam a Domino obtinuit gratiam vel virtu-
 tem, nisi secundum ipsius pie Matris dispensationem, Serm. 61.
 Art. 1. c. 8.* † *Matth. 11. 28.*

And who can read without the greatest Horrour, such a Prayer to the Blessed Virgin as this that follows: *O my Lady, holy Mary, I recommend my self into thy blessed trust, and singular custody, and into the bosom of thy Mercy, this night and evermore, and in the hour of my death, as also my Soul and my Body: And I yield unto thee all my hope and consolation, all my distress and miseries, my life and the end thereof, that by thy most holy intercession, and by thy merits, all my works may be directed according to thine and thy Son's will. Amen.* What fuller expressions can we use to declare our absolute affiance, trust and dependence on the eternal Son of God himself, than they here use in this recommendation to the Virgin? And who observes not that the will of the Blessed Virgin is expressly joyn'd with the will of her Son, as the rule of our Actions, and that so, as, that her will is set in the first place? A smatch of their old blasphemous impiety in advancing the Mother above the Son, and giving her a commanding power over him. Yet this recommendation to the Blessed Virgin is to be seen in a Manuel of Prayers and Litanies printed at *Antwerp* no longer ago than 1671, and that *permissu Superiorum*, appointed to be used in the Evening Prayer for Fryday. The Book I had from a near Relation of mine (who had been seduced to the Church of *Rome*, but afterwards returned again to the Communion of the Church of *England*) who assured me, that she her self used it, by the direction of her Confessor in her private Devotions.

There was a Book published (and that too *permissu Superiorum*) and in great vogue among our English Catholicks in the Reign of King *James the Second*, entituled, *Contemplations of the*

the Life and Glory of the holy Mary. Wherein you may find these words, God hath by a solemn Covenant pronounced Mary to be the treasury of Wisdom, Grace and Sanctity under Jesus. So that whatsoever gifts are bestow'd upon us by Jesus, we receive them by the mediation of Mary: No one being gracious to Jesus, who is not devoted to Mary, nor hath any one been specially confident of the Patronage of Mary, who hath not through her received a special blessing from Jesus. Whence it is one great mark of the Predestination of the Elect, to be singularly devoted to Mary, since she hath a full power as a Mother, to obtain of Jesus, whatever he can ask of God the Father, and is comprehended within the Sphere of Man's Predestination to Glory, Redemption from Sin, and Regeneration by Grace. Neither hath any one petitioned Mary, who was refused by Jesus, nor trusted in Mary and was abandoned by Jesus. Afterwards he tells us, p. 9. That tho' the condition of some great Sinners may be so deplorable, that all the limited Excellency, Merits, and Power, of all the Saints and Angels, cannot effectually bend the Mercies of Jesus to relieve them, yet such is the acceptableness of the Mother of Jesus, to Jesus, that whosoever is under the verge of her protection, may confide in her intercessions to Jesus. There needs no Comment to set forth the horridness of these assertions. Upon the whole matter, I cannot but think those silly Women of Arabia, who once a Year offer'd a Cake in honour to the Blessed Virgin as Queen of Heaven, to be as excusable at least as her Devotees in the Church of Rome. And yet they in their Days, were thought worthy of a place in the Catalogue of Hereticks ‡. Sure I am most of the Argu-

‡ *Heref. 79.*

ments, *Epiphanius* useth against the *Colliridians*, may serve every whit as well against the Papists.

To pass by the worship of Images, allow'd and practis'd in the Church of *Rome*, of which I have said enough before,

Come we now to the principal part of the Christian Worship, the holy Sacrament of the Eucharist. How lamentably hath the Church of *Rome* vitiated the primitive Institution of that most sacred Rite! She hath taken from the Laity, the blessed Cup, contrary to our blessed Saviour's express Command, as expounded by the practice of the Apostles, and of the universal Ch. of Christ for the first ten Centuries, as hath been above observ'd.

All the learned Advocates of the Roman Church with all their Sophistry have not been able to defend her in this matter, from manifest Sacrilege, and a violation of the very Essentials of the Sacrament, as to the Laity administer'd, nor can they prove it so administer'd to be a perfect Sacrament. He that would see this in a short compass fully proved, and all the weak Evasions of the Romanists obviated, may consult our learned Bp. *Davenant* *. Besides, the whole administration of it is so clogg'd, so metaphoriciz'd and defaced by the addition of a multitude of Ceremonies, and those some of them more becoming the Stage, than the Table of our Lord; that if the blessed Apostles were alive, and present at the celebration of the Mass in the Roman Church they would be amaz'd, and wonder what the meaning of it was; sure I am, they would never own it to be that same Ordinance which they left to the Churches.

But the worst Ceremony of all is the elevation of the Host, to be ador'd by the People, as

* *Determ. Quæst.* 58.

very Christ himself under the appearance of Bread, whole Christ, *ὁ αὐτός*, God and Man, while they neglect the old *sursum corda*, the lifting up of their Hearts to Heaven, where whole Christ indeed is. A practice this is, which nothing can excuse from the grossest Idolatry, but their gross stupidity, or rather insatiation, in thinking that a piece of Bread, can by any means whatsoever, or howsoever consecrated and blessed, become their very God and Saviour. A very sad excuse indeed. Moreover by what Reason, by what Scripture, by what example or practice of the primitive Churches, can the Romanists defend their carrying about the holy Sacrament in procession, or the mockery of their solitary Masses? I might pass from the holy Eucharist to the other Sacrament of Baptism, and expose the many strange Ceremonies used in the Roman Church in the Consecration of the Font, and in the very Administration of that Sacrament. I might also take notice of the Prayers used by the order of the Roman Church in the consecration or blessing of certain inanimate things, for the producing supernatural effects, such as curing Diseases, driving away Devils, &c. without any warrant from Scripture, or promise of God, that such effects shall follow. But I shall stop here.

I have now gone through the several Heads of discourse, which I proposed to my self, and sufficiently I think proved that the Church of Rome, hath altered the *Primitive Ecclesiastical Government*; changed the *primitive Canon or Rule of Faith*, and lastly miserably corrupted the *primitive Liturgy and Form of divine Worship*. For these reasons laid together, I can never be induced to enter into the Communion of the Roman Church as now it is: And for the same reason (to speak my mind freely) I wonder how so learned a Man as *Monsieur de Meaux* can with a good and quiet Conscience continue in it.

Hoc dicit Dominus, state super vias, & videte, & interrogate de semitis antiquis, quæ sit via bona, & ambulate in ea, & invenientis refrigerium animabus vestris, Jer. 6. v. 16.

F I N I S.

*The true Notion of the Catholick Church,
'in a Letter to the late Bishop of
Meaux, written by the Reverend
Mr. Charles Lesley.*

My Lord,

WE are ready with great chearfulness
to let your Lordship know what we
mean by the Catholick Church.

We do esteem every Bishop, with his College
of Presbyters and Deacons, and the Laity of his
District, to be a particular Church, wherein the
Bishop presides, as representing the Person of
Christ, and to be the Principle of Unity in his
Church, as St. Ignatius speaks.

And we think with St. Cyprian, (in his 68
Epist. to Pope Stephan, Edit. Oxon.) *Itcirco
enim, Frater charissime, copiosum est Corpus Sa-
cerdotum, concordia mutua glutino atque unitatis
vinculo copulatum, ut si quis ex Collegio nostro
Heresin facere, & Gregem Christi lacerare & va-
stare tentaverit, subveniant ceteri, & quasi Pa-
stores utiles & misericordes, oves Dominicas in
Gregem colligant.* Therefore, most dear Brother,
there is a very large Body of Bishops joined toge-
ther in the Cement of mutual Concord and the
Bond of Unity, that if any of our College attempt
to make a Schism, and rend, and destroy the Flock

of Christ, the rest should assist, and like good and merciful Pastors reduce the Lords (wandring) Sheep unto the Flock.

Hence all particular Churches, that is, every Bishop with his proper Flock, make up the whole, which is the Catholick Church.

And all these are one Flock, one Church to Christ, as St. Cyprian speaks, Ep. 55. *Cum sit à Christo una Ecclesia per totum Mundum in multa Membra divisa; ita Episcopatus unus, Episcoporum multorum Concordi Numerositate diffusus.* As there is one Church of Christ distinguished into many Members through the whole World; so there is one Episcopacy of a great united number of many Bishops diffused (through that one Church.) And again, *de Unit. Eccles. Episcopatus unus, cujus a singulis, in solidum, pars tenetur.* There is one Episcopacy, of which part is committed to every Bishop in full. Your Lordship knows, *in solidum* is a Law-phrase, and signifies, that part of this one Episcopacy is so committed to every single Bishop, that he is nevertheless charged with the care of the whole Church.

To maintain and regulate this Concord and Correspondence of the Bishops among themselves, they dispos'd of themselves into Provinces, and chose one Bishop of the Province to preside in their Councils when they met, with some particular Jurisdictions in the intervals, such as they thought fit, for the better regulation of the whole; but without the infringement of the Power of each Bishop within his own Diocese.

And as every Province of Bishops had such a Metropolitan, so when the several Provinces of one Nation or Kingdom met, they had a Primate or Metropolitan of the whole Nation, or Kingdom; still saving the Rights of the particular Metropolitans.

And

And when there shou'd be occasion for the Bishops of several Nations to meet, they had a Patriarch; still saving the Rights of the particular Primates, Metropolitans, and Bishops, each in their own Districts.

And if the Bishops of several Patriarchats met, the Precedence of these Patriarchs was adjusted, to avoid Conteſts.

But this Disposition was only among the Bishops of the *Roman Empire*, who might the more conveniently do it, as being all under one Emperor; and therefore, with his allowance, might meet in any place of his Empire.

This Empire was call'd *oikumenikē* whence a General Council of the Bishops of the Empire took the Stile of *Oecumenical*.

But there were many great and numerous Churches in *India*, and afterwards in the vast Empire of the *Abyssens* in *Africa*, which not being under the *Roman Empire*, never came to these Councils, nor indeed cou'd come. Neither cou'd they all meet together, having little or no correspondence together, because of the vast distance, and their not being under one Emperor, who might give them safe Conduct, and protect them when together.

The first place among the Patriarchs of the *Roman Empire* was given to the Bishop of *Rome*, that being then the Seat of the Empire.

But sometime after the Seat of the Empire had been translated to *Constantinople*, the Bishop of that See took the *Primacy* to himself, pretending to be the universal Bishop over the whole Catholick Church. This was the first time that Pretence was ever set up. And your Lordship knows very well the opposition which was given to him in this by *Gregory the Great*, then

Bishop of Rome ; who told him, That the See of Rome had the Preference to his in former Councils, and yet that none of his Predecessors, Bishops of Rome, did ever assume to themselves such an arrogant Title. He compares the Bishops to the Stars of God, and says, That whosoever sought to advance his Throne above these, did in that imitate the Pride of *Lucifer*, and was the fore-runner of Anti-Christ : And applies this to *John*, then Bishop of Constantinople, *Cum se penè per Orbem universum οὐκ ἐμπόνητον Patriarcham nominaret.* Here was a *penè*, so that it shoud seem as if he set himself up only as Head over all the Bishops in the Roman Empire. We do believe that your Lordship, and the whole Gallican Church, will readily agree with this Reasoning of the same Gregory, that, *Si unus Episcopus vocatur Universalis, Universa Ecclesia corrumpitur, si unus universus cadet* : And he says, *Absit à cordibus Christianorum Nomen istud Blasphemiae, in quo omnium Sacerdotum Honor adimitur, dum ab uno sibi dementer arrogatur.* I refer your Lordship for this, and much more to the same purpose, to his Books of Epistles, *Lib. IV. Ep. 32, 33, 34, 36, 38. Lib. VI. Ep. 24, 28, 30, 39. Lib. VIII. Ep. 30. Lib. XI. Ep. 45.*

And now, my Lord, when we saw such an universal Supremacy set up at Rome, which Gregory the Great call'd *Blasphemy* and *Madness* ; and that enforc'd upon us, as of Faith, the *Summa rei Christianae*, as Cardinal Bellarmin calls it, *Pref. ad Lib. de Rom. Pont.* and says, *L. 1. 10. Est enim revera non simplex Error, sed perniciofa Hæresis negare B. Petri Primatum à Christo institutum* : And from thence this universal Primacy of the Pope, as Successor to St. Peter ; was it not time then, my Lord, to stand up against it ?

Your

Your illustrious Church has done it as well as we, in your memorable Decrees made in your General Assembly, *An. 1682.* with this difference, That you only limit his Supremacy, whereas we have withdrawn our selves from under it. You say there, *Hinc Apostolica potestatis usum moderandum per Canones ——— valere etiam Regulas, Mores, & Instituta à Regno & Ecclesia Gallicana recepta, Patrumque terminos manere Inconcussos.*

Now we beseech your Lordship to help us to understand, who has power to limit a Supremacy founded by Christ? Do you assert the Liberties of the *Gallican Church* only as Concessions granted you by the Pope? Or, as your original Rights, and never justly under his power? The latter, I suppose, you stand upon. Then his Supremacy is not absolute. And where shall we find the Limitations? And who is judge of these Limitations? If any other than the Pope, they are superior to him, who is the Supreme.

But then it may be said to us, Why do we not allow to the Patriarch of *Rome* the Dignity of that Primacy, which we own to have been affix'd to his See by the Canons, and consent of so many Bishops?

1. Because he will not be content with it: But claims more, even an universal Supremacy over the whole Catholick Church. And that not *Jure Ecclesiastico* only, from the agreement and consent of his fellow Bishops, but *Jure Divino*, from the immediate disposition of our Lord Christ; and to that end, quores several Texts of Scripture, which we think, with the ancient Fathers, infer no such thing.

2. Because he pretends not only to a Primacy of Order, but to an absolute and unlimited Sovereignty over all the Bishops in the World,

whom he would have to be his *Subjects*, instead of his *Colleagues*. And this we think does totally subvert that Disposition and Government of the Church, in which our Lord and his Apostles left it, and as it was understood and practised in the first and purest Ages. Therefore we think we should be Traditors of the sacred *Depositum*, if we should give way to it, especially considering, That

3. From this Sovereignty and Supremacy, an Infallibility in his Person has been infer'd, as the only Successor of St. *Peter*, and Heir of all the Promises and Privileges given unto him, superior to the Authority of all Councils, which derive their Power from him; And to determine of Faith as well as of Manners, as being the only living Judge of Controversie, always in being; insomuch that Cardinal *Bellarmino* is forc'd to affirm that it is impossible the Pope should err, for this absurdity he says would follow, *Si autem Papa erraret precipiendo vitia, vel prohibendo virtutes, teneretur Ecclesia credere vitia esse bona, & virtutes malas, nisi vellet contra Conscientiam peccare*, de Rom. Pont. l. 4. c. 5. And more could not be said of Christ.

4. From all this has been infer'd an absolute and supreme temporal Power in him, even to depose Princes, and absolve their Subjects from their Allegiance, which is expressly vindicated to him in the 4th Council of *Lateran*, c. 3.

We know, my Lord, that in the *Gallican* Decrees of 1682, this Power of his to exau'torac Kings, is absolutely deny'd. As likewise his Infallibility. And he is there subjected to Councils, even to be deposed and excommunicated by them. And his Supremacy is limited, not only by the Canons of Councils, but by the Rules and Orders of every National Church.

But,

But, my Lord, how can this bring us to own his Supremacy, even in the limited sense of the *Gallican Church*, when we know at the same time, that he will not submit to it, nay that he stood out against it, till the necessity of Affairs pressing your King, in the last Confederacy against him, the Bishops of *France* were forc'd to sign a retraction of these Decrees; till which time the Pope refused to preconize any of their Bishops. And your Lordship must know better than we do, That it was the Pope who set up the Confederacy against *France*, chiefly upon the point of these Decrees. And the first Article of what was called, *The Resolution of the Princes, Allies, and Confederates, which was taken in the Assembly at the Hague, February 4. 1691.* was in these words, *That no Peace be made with Lewis XIV. till he has made Reparation to the Holy See, for whatsoever he has acted against it; and till he annul and make void all those infamous Proceedings against the holy Father Innocent XI.*

And this was agreeable to the Actings of his Predecessors. Particularly in *France*, whose learned Church always contested their Liberties, against the Plenitude of the Papal Supremacy, which sought to swallow them up. And it is very observable, That tho' the Rebellion of the Holy League in *France* lasted during the Reigns of six Popes, every one of these Popes was for the League against the King. And Cardinal *Cajetan* Legate there for the Pope, in the Year 1593, made this his main Argument to justify that Rebellion, that so many Popes had concurr'd in it. This we are told by *D'Avila* in his History of the Civil Wars of *France*, Lib. 13. But I will trouble your Lordship no farther with Instances of Popes fomenting Rebellions of Subjects against their

their Natural Princes, and their deposing of Kings, on pretence of this their Universal Supremacy. These things are well known to your Lordship. And we do believe, That the whole *Gallican* Church does abhor and detest such Doctrines.

But, my Lord, we do thus judge, That if the Pope will not be content with that Supremacy of Order, which was given to him, *jure* only *Ecclesiastica*, and as the first of the Patriarchs within the Roman Empire; but will assume a Supremacy over the whole Catholick Church, even of all Churches which never yet did own his Supremacy over them:

And withal will turn this Supremacy of Order, into an absolute and despotick Sovereignty, Temporal as well as Spiritual; with an Infallibility of Decision in himself, in all matters of Faith, as well as Morals: And having practised all this for many Ages, and been supported in it by the learned Writers of his side, as well as countenanc'd in it, at least, by several Councils of his calling; and will not to this day be brought to disown any of these pretences; nor to acknowledge that he has received this his Supremacy from any Ecclesiastical Establishment of his Fellow-Bishops; But asserts it as of Divine Right, and therefore unlimitable, and indefeasible: My Lord, we then judge, That he has truly forfeited that Ecclesiastical Primacy given to him by the Canons. As if a Judge, the General of an Army, or President of the King's Council, should disown the King, or any Authority from him, and set himself up as King, and assume the Regal Stile, it would be Treason in any to adhere longer to him, or to obey him on pretence of the Commission he formerly had from the King.

My

My Lord, we think it incumbent upon every Bishop of the Church to assert his own inherent Power, given to him by our Lord, and to restore the Discipline of the primitive Church, which leaves him Supreme in his own Diocess, not hurt or infring'd in the least by the Regulations made among the Bishops themselves, for their mutual Correspondence, and Management of the Affairs of the Episcopal College. We consider with St. Cyprian, Ep. 73. *Quam periculosum sit in Divinis rebus, ut quis cedat Jure suo & Potestate.*

I am inclinable to believe, That if your Lordship, in particular, and other Bishops of the *Gallican* Church were at liberty, each in his own District, to regulate such matters as you might do with a good Conscience, things might be brought to bear so, from such a happy beginning of Reformation, as that tho' Men might differ in some particular Opinions, as they always will, yet that terms of Communion might be adjusted between us, upon Catholick Principles, to the Honour of God, and Peace of his Church. And if such a Communion were begun, tho' but with a few Bishops, who would exert their just Power, it might bring the Church to that State in time, in which all good Men wish to see her. And if a Catholick Communion were restor'd, we should see again the primitive face of the Church. But no step can be made towards this, while the Pope's Supremacy ties up the power of all other Bishops, in their own respective Churches. And we hardly expect that he will give way to any thing that will in the least infringe the Plenitude of his Supremacy. You have made an Experiment of it, in your General Assembly of 1682. And if he will not suffer his Supremacy to be limited,

limited, and reduc'd to the Standard of the ancient Canons, we can see no remedy, my Lord, but that it must be taken away. Why shou'd we have any hesitation to take that out of the way, which is the visible *Remora* to the uniting of all Christian Churches, and the restoring of Catholic Communion all the World over? To take that out of the way, which your Bishops of *France*, as well as those of the *Greek Church*, and ours in *England*, are fully convinc'd is an Usurpation? Against which, you have often struggl'd, and still do complain. But we have thrown it off, seeing no other way possible to get from under its Usurpation.

My Lord, I am satisfy'd that your Church and ours are nearer to one another, as to this Point of the Supremacy, than you are with the Church, at least with the Court of *Rome*.

We see, my Lord, the Peace of the World better consult'd by the Divine Providence, in many independent Kings, than in one universal Monarch; Whose Deputies, in far distant Regions, cou'd never be kept from Revolts, as we have seen in great Monarchies, tho' none was ever yet universal. And betwixt a King and his Rebels, there is no interposing by his Subjects, it wou'd justly render such suspected who shou'd argue on the Rebels side. Therefore the End must be extermination of the one, or the other. Whereas in Disputes betwixt Kings, other Kings may interpose their Mediation, and become Guarantees of Peace.

And yet the whole World is one Kingdom to God, as it is written, *Psal. xxi. 29. Domini est Regnum, & ipse dominabitur Gentium.* How vain then wou'd the Dispute be betwixt any of these Nations, suppose *France*, *Spain*, or *England*, which

which
each
dom
this

Su
betw
the
them
tent
who

A
narc
all
cou'
trov
and
dift

B
fo t
Chu
ther
sus
whi
obli
fali
wis
sup
tho
fall
the
fali
by
the
ed
ext
Ch

which of them were this one Kingdom, when each of them, tho' greater than any other Kingdom of the Earth, would still be but a part of this one Kingdom?

Such, my Lord, we esteem the Dispute to be betwixt particular Churches; which of them is the Catholick Church? We must say, None of them; tho' one be much greater and more potent than another, yet it is still but a part of the whole.

And as God has appointed no universal Monarch, neither has he an universal Bishop. And all the Arguments which an universal Bishop cou'd use for Unity and Peace, and to end Controversies, might be us'd by an universal Monarch; and both prove equally fallacious, to the greater disturbance rather than settlement of that Peace.

But as our Faith is dearer to us than our Lives, so the mischief wou'd be greater, if the whole Church shou'd be made to depend upon one; for then, *Universa Ecclesia corrui, si unus Universus cadit*. And if the Church falls, the Faith which is built upon it must fall with it. This oblig'd the Popes when they set up for Universality, to assert Infallibility to themselves likewise; because indeed, less than that cou'd not support so vast a charge, as that of the whole Catholick Church. But since their Infallibility is fallen, at least in *France*, we think it strange that their Universality shou'd survive it. An Universality which never yet was in Fact! never own'd by the Catholick Church, or any Churches out of the Bounds of the Western Empire; nor intended, when first us'd in the Western Councils, to extend any farther.

How much safer has Christ consulted for his Church, than to put it all into the hands of one fallible

fallible Man! *Idcirco copiosum fecit Corpus Sacerdotum, ut si unus lacerare & vastare tentaverit, ceteri subveniant*; as in the case of *Paulus Samosatenus*. Thus the Peace of the World is preserv'd, and thus the Peace of the Church. And thus it is that God has dispos'd of both; whose Foolishness is wiser than Men.

But your Lordship asks, how these several Churches can be that Kingdom of Jesus Christ, not divided in it self, and which can never fail? My Lord, our Blessed Saviour has told us, That there will be Divisions in his Church: And the experience of all Ages has made it good. But if the meaning be, That Schismatics and Hereticks, who go out of the Church, are no longer of it; and so the Church, that is, those who remain, are not divided; in this sense no Church can be divided, if but three or four were left. But, is a Church divided when there is a Schism within her own Bowels; and Bishops and Anti Bishops set up among those who are otherwise of the same Communion, Doctrine, and Worship? Your Lordship knows very well (without referring you to *Platina*,) how many Schisms of this sort have been in the Church of *Rome* from the time of *Cornelius* and *Novatian*, Popes and Anti-Popes set up against one another, and some of them lasting for many Years together.

But if Schism does not divide a Church, then, my Lord, you have clear'd us, as to any Schisms among us, at the same time that you vindicate the Church of *Rome*: But with this difference, That where the whole Authority of a Church is center'd in one, as the supreme Head and Principle of Unity to all the Bishops and Churches which compose that one Church, there a Schism concerning such an universal Head; and when
several

severa
tion t
more
when
nate
Met
and
amon
comm
rent a
mons
wou
shou
is Tr
of an
of th
But
And
Bu
the V
any
shoul
Chri
with
Th
I. 20
Rule
Prim
good
gluti
the t
of w
than
tence
no ef
lick
his

several such Heads are set up together, in opposition to one another, the Schism must be much more fatal to the Unity of that Church, than where such a Dispute falls out amongst co-ordinate and independent Bishops, united only in a Metropolitan or Primate of their own Option, and subjected to such Rules as are concerted among them, for the better regulation of their common Body. These two Cases are as different as a Division in our House of Lords or Commons, who shou'd be their *President* or *Speaker*; wou'd differ from a Division of the Nation, who shou'd be their King: To set up another King is Treason; not so of a Speaker, or the President of any Court. A Metropolitan is but President of the Court of Bishops, chosen by themselves. But the Pope pretends to be King and Supreme: And two *Popes* are two *Kings* of the Church.

But now, my Lord, if all the Kingdoms in the World make one Kingdom to God, without any universal Vicar or Monarch under him, why should it be difficult to apprehend how all the Christian Churches make one Church to Christ without any universal Bishop?

The Bishops, who are the Stars of God, (*Apoc.* 1. 20.) and Princes of his Church, are, by the Rules of Catholick Communion, (observ'd in the Primitive Church, and which it is wish'd by all good Christians were restor'd,) *Concordiæ mutue glutino atque unitatis vinculo copulati*, more than the temporal Princes of the World are: Each of whose Power and Authority reaches no farther than the extent of his own Dominions; his Sentence, whether of Death, Confiscation, &c. has no effect elsewhere. But by the Rules of Catholick Discipline, the Sentence of every Bishop in his own Church has its Effect all the Christian World

World over, and every Bishop is oblig'd to maintain the Rights and Jurisdiction of every other Bishop: So that any Person justly excommunicated by his proper Bishop, stands excommunicated from all other Bishops and Churches, and consequently from the Catholick Church; and when absolv'd by his own Bishop, is thereby restor'd to the Peace and Communion of the Catholick Church. Because the whole Catholick Church is one Flock, in the Language of St. Cyprian, who says, Ep. 67. *Nam etsi Pastores multi sumus, unum tamen Gregem pascimus, & oves universas.* For though we be many Pastors, yet we feed one and the same Flock, in general all the Sheep (of Christ.) And, Ep. 55. *Singulis Pastoribus portio Gregis adscripta est, quam regat unusquisque & gubernet.* A share of the Flock, which every one is to rule and govern, is committed severally to single Pastors. And the difference of Discipline among Bishops, each in his own Diocese, does not at all break this Unity; concerning which he says, Ep. 72. *Ceterum scimus quosdam quod semel imbiberint, nolle deponere, nec Propositum suum facile mutare; sed salvo inter Collegas, pacis ac Concordiae vinculo, quadam propria, quae apud se semel sint usurpata retinere. Qua in re, nec nos vim cuiquam facimus, aut legem damus; cum habeat in Ecclesia administratione, voluntatis suae Liberum Arbitrium unusquisque Praepositus, rationem sui Actus Domino redditurus.* But we know, that some will never part with what they have once imbibed, nor change their Opinion, but keeping the Bond of Peace and Concord among their Colleagues, will retain some of their own Practices, which they have once used. In which case, neither do we use unreasonable violence towards any, or give Laws to others, because every Bishop hath
free

free
the
give
And
Gov
own
Conc
way
Bish
but
copu
any
assu
lege
to
with
I
Gre
to
stian
Kin
be
fus
tho
only
ral
in
Pre
fide
any
tho
nar
of
wo
op
lon

free liberty of acting according to his own Will in the Administration of the Church, as one who is to give an account of his own acting to the Lord. And therefore leaving every Bishop to the full Government of his own Diocese, according to his own Will, only, *Salva inter Collegas Pacis ac Concordiæ vinculo*, he impos'd not any thing by way of any Authority he had, upon any of the Bishops whom he call'd to Council at Carthage, but said, *Neque enim quisquam nostrum Episcopum se Episcoporum constituit*: Neither doth any of us make himself a Bishop of Bishops. He assum'd no more than as President of that College of Bishops, without thinking he had power to interpose in the Government of any Bishop within his own Diocese.

It is said in the History of your Henry the Great of France, That he had it in his thoughts to have erected a *regal College* of all the Christian Kings in Europe, by the consent of all the Kings, wherein all Differences among them shou'd be adjust'd by common consent, and whoso refus'd to stand to the Decision of that College, shou'd be compell'd by the rest. But this was only to determin of Differences among the several Kings, not to prescribe Laws for any King in his own Dominions: Nor did it give the President (whatever King shou'd be chosen President of that College,) any power whatever in any of the other Kings Dominions. And if he shou'd assert it, and claim to be universal Monarch over all these Kingdoms, upon the account of his being President of the Regal College, it wou'd be a manifest Usurpation, and ought to be oppos'd by all of these Kings, who shou'd no longer own him even as President: And his Arguments

ments for Unity, and that all shou'd submit to him for Peace-sake, wou'd be very ridiculous.

That which your *Henry the Great* wish'd and endeavour'd to bring to pass, as to the greater Unity of Kings, was in great measure effected in the General Councils of the Bishops, within the compass of the *Roman Empire* in purer times; and might still be farther, in Councils more general, as the Commerce of the World encreases, if the Supremacy of one did not hinder all others to attempt it.

Upon the whole, we think, That as all the Kingdoms of the World are one Kingdom to God; so, that the several Churches, which, according to the Primitive Constitution, are much more united than the Principalities of the Earth, may be justly term'd one Catholick Church; and that without one, universal Head or Sovereign upon Earth, which, as I have said, was never yet in Fact; and if it were, wou'd be of fatal consequence to the Faith, and Unity of the Church, and that Frame in which our Blefed Lord, and his Apostles left it.

And upon this pretended Sovereignty of the Pope, we charge the Schism of those who have broke off from the subjection to their proper Bishops: For *Calvin* himself says, *Talem si nobis Hierarchiam exhibeant, in qua sic emineant Episcopi, ut Christo subesse non recusent, & ab illo tanquam Unico Capite pendeant*—*Tum vero nullo non Anathemate dignos fatear si qui erunt qui non eam revereantur, summaque obedientia observent.* (*De Necessit. Eccles. Reformand.*) And *Beza* says, *Si qui sunt (quod sana mihi non facile persuaseris) qui omnem Episcoporum Ordinem Rejiciant, absit ut quisquam satis sanæ mentis furo-*
ribus

ribus illorum assentiatur. (Bez. ad *Tract. de Minister. Evang. ab Hadrian. Sarao. Belga Edit. c. 1.*). And says as to the Episcopacy of the Church of England, (*ibid. c. 18.*) *Fruatur sane ista singulari Dei providentia; & utinam sit illi perpetua.*

From hence, others have proceeded to throw off Episcopacy it self. But we see from what Spring all these have flow'd. And from the Disease we discover the Remedy, which is, To restore the *Episcopatus vigorem*, the *Sacerdotii sublime fastigium*, as St. Cyprian calls the Power of every Bishop in his own District: Of which, St. Ignatius and the first Fathers spoke such great things, without so much as a Hint of the Sovereignty of one Bishop over the rest; which was a Notion not known in those Ages.

We think the Divine and Apostolick Authority of the Episcopat, swallow'd up at Rome, in the Sovereignty of the Pontificat: As the learn'd Arch-Bishop of Spalato, *Marc. Anton. de Dom.* did observe, and in his *Consilium Professionis*, gave it as the reason of his leaving that Communion; and joining himself to a Church where Episcopacy was Free and Primitive.

My Lord, what we plead for is the Restoration of the Original Rights of Episcopacy in the Roman Communion: Where, tho' the Name is retain'd, yet the Power is swallow'd up in one. Without whom, none of the other Bishops have the freedom of their own Judgments left to them; or dare not exert it.

We shou'd then think the time for healing of Schism and unity of the Church approaching; if the Bishops in her Communion wou'd think themselves at liberty, wou'd be perswaded that it was their Duty, as answerable to God, to exert the full of their Apostolical Authority; each in his

own Diocese; where, as St. Cyprian says, *Ep. 59. Juxta Vice Christi cogitatur: He is to be esteem'd as a Judge in the place of Christ.* And, *Ep. 69. That he ought Cathedram sibi Constituere, & Primum assumere.* And, *Ep. 68. speaks of the Bishops in general, as Gubernanda Ecclesiae Libram tenentes: Holding the balance of Church Government.* If we cou'd treat with your Lordship in this stile, and say with him, *Ep. 3. Cum pro Episcopatus vigore, & Cathedrae Autoritate, haberes Potestatem;* if you wou'd bear such Language from us, we shou'd hope a good Effect: We might then come to understand one another better than we have done. But if your Lordship think not your self at liberty to make any Reformation in your own Diocese, even in things which you cou'd not only allow, but might desire were done; and which might have so blessed an Effect, as the beginning of a Catholick Communion: We must then say, with the great Father before nam'd, *Ep. 59. Si ita res est — Adum est de Episcopatus vigore.*

But leaving all this to the good time and disposition of Providence, I shall think my self happy, and my Pains abundantly recompenc'd, if I may have afforded to a Man of your Lordship's Character, Learning, and Sagacity, any clearer view of our Notions of the Catholick Church, than from your unacquaintedness with our Writings, have come to your Lordship's knowledge before.

I beg your Lordship's patience for one word more, as to what your Lordship says concerning *the infallible Assistance of the Holy Ghost in the Council of Nice, and consequently in all such Assemblies of the same Church.* My Lord, we know of no such Promise particularly apply'd to Councils; nor to any particular Church: Several of whose

wh
m
ly
w
Bu
we
cil
Co
cils
any
refi
rec
pos
the
it.
T
be,
shor
ted
And
B
and
Cree
tho'
yet
Vote
the
tures
the
shew
they
der,
Arim
cil,
ring

whose Candlesticks have been remov'd, and others may. We doubt not the Assistance of God's Holy Spirit to every Man, and Assemblies of Men who seek his Glory, with an unfeigned Heart. But this Grace may be resisted by Assemblies, as well as by private Men. Witness the second Council of *Ephesus*, and, as we maintain, the second Council of *Nice*.

My Lord, neither you nor we think, that Councils can add any one Article to the Creed, or take any away. But upon the arising of any new Heresie, a Council is the best Evidence of the Faith receiv'd in those Churches of which it is compos'd. Thus they are Witnesses and Guards of the Faith, but neither the Authors, or Masters of it.

There never yet was, nor we believe ever will be, (and we think it not necessary that there shou'd be) a Council compos'd of Bishops deputed from all the Christian Churches in the World. And none other can be call'd truly universal.

But, blessed be God, all retain the Foundation and Summary of our Faith, that is, The Apostles Creed, as explain'd by the Council of *Nice*. And tho' some differ in the sense of some Parts of it, yet they are not to be convinc'd by majority of Votes in a Council; but by laying before them the Primitive Doctrine, built upon the Holy Scriptures, and sufficiently attested and witnessed in the first and After-Ages of the Church. And to shew the beginning and rise of Heresies, and that they were not from the beginning. So *Alexander*, Bishop of *Alexandria*, proceeded against *Arius*, by asking the Bishops assembled in Council, *Quis unquam talia audivit?* And all declaring that they had never heard of such a Doctrine

before; it was therefore novel, and so to be rejected: Not from the Authority of the Council, but their undeniable Testimony, witnessed by all their Flocks, who constantly heard their Doctrine.

Every Bishop, as supreme in his own Church, and a Council of Bishops assembled, may condemn such an Heresie, and forbid Communion with such and such, or not, as they shall find it most expedient for the saving of their own Flocks, and the general good of the Catholick Church. For this is Matter of Discipline. And in this they have Authority, to which their Flocks ought to submit: And this they may alter, retain; or relax, according to the variation of Times and Circumstances. But the Faith they cannot alter, only bear witness to it; therefore in Matters of Faith they have no Authority, properly speaking: For Example, they have no Authority to determine, Whether there be a God, or not? Whether Christ is come in the Flesh? Whether he dy'd for the Sins of Men? Whether the Holy Scriptures are true? Whether we ought to receive the Creed? Their Negative in any of these Points must be detested by all Christians. And these are the highest Points of Faith, wherein they have no Authority, can determine nothing by their Authority, cannot make use of that Topick to convince any Gain-sayer. For no Bishop, or Council of Bishops, can have any Authority, but upon the supposition of a God, a Christ, of the Truth of the Holy Scriptures, whence they prove their Authority. And therefore none of these can stand upon their Authority. But the Church does bear witness to the Truth, and preaches, and preserves that Faith which was once deliver'd to the Saints; and

and in this sense, is the Pillar and ground of the Truth, as the supporters and propagators of it, not the Authors of it, or having dominion over it. To convince us in which, it has pleas'd God to permit Councils, even those who have call'd themselves œcumenical, to fall into gross Errors, as the fourth of *Lateran*, that enacted the deposing Doctrine, which both the *Gallican* and *English* Church think to be damnable, according to *Rom. xiii. 2*. And not only so, but œcumenical Councils have oppos'd and contradicted one another, have censur'd and condemn'd each other, as the second Council of *Ephesus* was condemn'd by the fourth General Council at *Chalcedon*.

Besides the Dispute, not yet determin'd, in the Church of *Rome*, where that Infallibility of which your Lordship speaks, is plac'd: Whether in the Pope alone, as the only Successor of *St. Peter*, and Heir of the Promises made to him, of *Super banc Petram — Tibi dabo Claves, &c.* as *Bellarmin*, and the *Canonists* and *School-men* have contended? Or, Whether in a Council, as superior to the Pope, according to the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil*? Or, Whether in neither of them separate, but only in both together? Or, lastly, (because of many Objections even in that Scheme, some Popes and Councils having been against others,) Whether this Infallibility is to be look'd for only in the Church diffusive, as some of their Writers do assert? This Uncertainty must render this Infallibility utterly uncertain: Seeing it is the same, not to have a thing, as not to know where to find it. And none can embrace any one of these Schemes of Infallibility, but he must oppose all the others, and consequently, the greatest part (it may happen) of the Church of

Rome, because there are so many odds against him. For none can hold to more than one of these Schemes, they being all so opposite to one another, that if any one of them be true, all the rest must be false. And, according to *Bellarmin*, (as before quoted) heretical, as overthrowing the very *Summa rei Christiana*.

And now, my Lord, you cannot think it strange, That we shou'd be at a loss about this Infallibility, when there is so great variety, and even contradiction among those who do assert it.

But tho' we think no Church to be infallible, yet we have an infallible assurance of the Faith, in its being deliver'd down to us, by such an universal consent of all Ages and Churches, as that it was not in their power, tho' they shou'd be suppos'd so wicked as to design it, at such vast distance, even where all correspondence was stop'd, to have combin'd together, and all agree in the self-same Doctrine, if it had not been the same which had been taught them from the beginning. And the rise of Heresies does rather confirm the truth of this; because such were found to be Novelties, and to go against this universal Tradition: Which whatever has, according to the Rule of *Vincentius Lirinensis*, *Quod semper, ubique, & ab omnibus*, we willingly receive; and what has not this Evidence, we cannot admit as of Faith.

We rest fully satisfy'd and assur'd of Christ's Promise, That he will always preserve a Church to himself upon Earth, (tho' there is no Promise to *Rome*, *England*, or any particular Church,) against which the Gates of Hell shall not finally prevail. But we are told, That they will be permitted to make great inroads upon her, and she

she is represented to us, as persecuted in the Wilderness, at some times.

God grant we may see her Restauration. And I am confident your Lordship will join with us in this Prayer, That the $\delta\ \kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\chi\omega\nu$, (whoever, or whatever it is,) $\epsilon\kappa\ \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \chi\acute{\rho}\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$. Amen.

Sept. 26. 1703.

Y 4

A Letter

*A Letter to an English Priest of the
Roman Communion at Rome.*

I Should not so long have neglected answering your obliging Lines of the 30th of Sept. last; if I had not expected the happiness of your good Company here at *Florence*; the Postscript of your Letter led me into this error, and *Don-John*, my Lord Cardinal's Cup-bearer confirmed me in it, and 'tis but lately I have been undeceived. I am glad you had such satisfaction from your Journey to *Naples*: I don't question the truth of that matter of fact of which you affirm your self to have been an eye-witness; yet I cannot apprehend how you can be assur'd that the *Substance which you saw in the glass Vial hard and dry like reddish Earth, and which you might have crumbled with your Fingers, was, when liquified, Blood*; nor yet less that it was the Blood of *St. Januarius Bishop of Benevent, martyr'd in the time of Dioclesian*, as you are pleased to affirm in your Letter. But I wonder most how you can pretend to be convinced with perfect evidence of sense, that there was no humane Artifice in this. The relation that your senses gave you, was only that upon the contact of the Silver Case wherein is supposed to be deposited the Head of the same Saint, the dry matter like reddish Earth liquified, and became soft like a cake of Blood; now all this may be true, and yet the whole business an Imposture. For one ought to examine what causes there may be in natural things

things capable to produce the same effect; and upon what Authority this supposed Miracle is established; for certainly you will not say, there has never been any false Miracles pretended to in the Church of Rome. Therefore I conclude that the evidence of sense you had in this case, could not be a perfect conviction to you, that you was not imposed upon by the subtilty of others. I will not make any advantage of that disparagement you often put upon the evidence of sense in other cases, and consequently weaken the strength of its assurance; but I think the inference you draw from the whole as lame, as the former assertion, *viz. That 'twas God alone did it, who one day will make dead Bones, and dead Blood live;* for Miracles, when true, are not always the immediat effect of divine Power, and Angels both good and bad may do such things as exceed any natural Power known to us. I am sure the Scripture tells us that the *working of Satan is with all Power, and Signs, and lying Wonders,* and where the love of the truth is not received, God will send strong delusions that they should believe a Lye. I am not much concern'd for the reflection you make upon our Church for want of Miracles; 'twas the same thing in the time of St. Chrysostome, who in his sixth Homily upon the first Epistle to the Corinthians, shews the necessity and usefulness of them for the establishing Christianity, which being once effected, 'twas rather necessary they should cease than continue; for if Miracles were always visible, Faith would have less merit, and consequently less reward. I am thorowly satisfied that the Christian Religion was confirmed by the Miracles of our Saviour and his Apostles, which tho' they were not in that great abundance, nor upon such trivial occasions, as are those produced by the

Roman Church, yet they will much better bear the test of a strict examination, and carry greater evidences of their Divinity. As for the proof of negatives, I govern my self by St. Paul's rule, that *if any pervert the Gospel of Christ, or that he or an Angel from Heaven should preach any other Gospel, let them be accursed.* This is the sure word of Prophecy, whereunto you would do well to take heed, as unto a light, that shineth in a dark place.

I would not be thought to detract from the vertue of Faith, for without it 'tis impossible to please God; tho' I cannot but observe that you mistake St. Paul, when you make him to say, *that tho' we give all we have to the Poor, yet without Faith it avails nothing.* 'Tis to Charity he gives such a high encomium in that Chapter, and lest Christians should lay too great a stress upon their Orthodoxy in believing, he adds that tho' one *has all Faith, so that he could remove Mountains, and have no Charity, he is nothing.* The parting with all one has, and the laying down one's very Life, the two great instances our Saviour gives of the perfection of his Doctrine, are not sufficient without this noble vertue. This is that more excellent way the Apostle shew'd unto the *Corinthians*, and which he desired them earnestly to covet.

I would not have you mistake me, therefore, I assure you, I no more take the Court of *Rome*, than I do the Roman Church, for the Catholick Church. But being, when at *Rome*, at the head, as you suppose, of Unity, one may be thought likelier to get some knowledge of the Body there, than in a pestilential northern Air, and this was all I pretended to, if you persist to think otherways, I submit.

I have

I have carefully considered what you say about *Infallibility*, and I cannot find you have in the least shaken the evidence of my Proposition, *viz.* *That Infallibility, the ground of all your Delusions, has no foundation either in Holy Scriptures, or primitive Antiquity.* 'Tis like a House built upon a Rock, that can bear the attacks of the greatest subtilty, and can receive no prejudice from the artificial attempts that are made to destroy it. You ask me, *How I am persuaded of this?* 'Tis only by having examined Scripture and Antiquity, both which I find silent concerning this point. At the same time I own my self to be a Man, which implies a Creature subject to error, *Et nihil humani a me alienum esse puto*; therefore you have no reason to assent to what I propose, till you have made the same tryal. And tho' I am not so unjust as to be angry with you for suspecting me to be in the wrong, yet it would have been much better for you to have proved it, than only to mistrust it; for your Letter brings no conviction of the interest that Doctrine of *Infallibility* has either in Scripture or Antiquity. All you quote from the one is our Saviour's promise of *being with his Disciples to the end of the World.* And why should we think, say you, *he would be with them, but to preserve them from error?* All that you urge from the other, is the liberty the ancient Councils took of making their Definitions Articles of Faith; as, *that Christ is Consubstantial with the Father, &c.* which Creed we own and receive, and therefore consequently you infer we ought to embrace the *Infallibility* of the Church. To both I will give you as plain and short answers as I can, *Et valeant quantum valere possint.* As to the Promise of our Saviour, which we find recorded in the

28th of St. Matth. 19, 20. *Go ye therefore, and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo I am with you always, even to the end of the World.* All that can reasonably be drawn from this Text is, that the Christian Church shall be always existent to the end of the World. Tho' if it were positive for its Infallibility, as it is for its existency, yet before it would do you any good, you must prove, that by *you*, is meant *you*, and *only you*, of the Church of Rome; that Christ has obliged himself not only to give sufficient means of direction, but that he will necessitate Men to follow them, and that he will not only preserve them from all damnable Errors, but also from all erroneous Doctrines. Yet if this were granted, which you cannot expect from me; if the promise here be absolute, every one who has power to preach and baptize, might claim infallible assistance by virtue of it; and so every Parish Priest would have as good a title to Infallibility as the Pope and a General Council. 'Tis certain there is no difficulty in believing that God could have promised to his Church a total preservation from error; as it is Blasphemy to say he would not have made it good, if he had promised it. But our question is whether he has promised it or no? Not what God is capable of doing? But what God has really and actually done? If you object I interpret Scripture by my own private reason which is liable to error, I would feign know a better method of proceeding, as long as the infallible Interpreter is the Controversy in debate.

I think the proof you bring from *Antiquity*, makes as little to the purpose as that you have brought

brought from the Scripture, for where is the consequence, that a General Council has explained an Article of Faith, and that this explanation has been received by the Catholick Church, *ergo*, the Church of Rome is Infallible. We receive the determinations of the Council of Nice, because they are agreeable to Scripture, and to the sentiments of the Fathers, both of the Greek and Latin Church, which preceded that General Council. We reject the determinations of the Council of Ariminum, because they are contrary to both. So that our receiving them does not depend upon the opinion of their Infallibility. They never arrogated this privilege to themselves, for if they had pretended to it, they could not have neglected to have settled a matter of such importance as the foundation of all their proceedings, their silence in this case is worth a thousand Arguments; for who can think it could be their interest to have concealed so great a Treasure. And lest in time great inconveniences might happen by pretending to explicate the Articles of Faith, and by inserting those explications in the Creed, one of the first four General Councils, I think 'tis that of Ephesus, tho' I am not positive, for I have not Books by me to clear it, made a Decree, which prohibited the farther enlarging of the Creed by any additional explications, foreseeing those Mischiefs which latter Ages have felt, and which particularly the Council of Trent has burthened us with.

I am not ignorant that two of your great Champions, Cardinal Perron, and Petavius, to raise the Authority of General Councils, and to make the rule of their Faith appear more plausible, have aspersed not only the Holy Scriptures

as

incapable, by reason of their obscurity, to prove the great and necessary point of our Saviour's Divinity; but have also impeached the Fathers of the first three Centuries as tardy in the same point, whose Writings they say, touching this important Article, *Cum Orthodoxa Fidei regula minime consentiunt*. Blessed God! that Men should be so fond of humane Inventions, as to sacrifice to them those Pillars of our Faith, which are alone proper and able to support it, I mean Scripture, and primitive Antiquity. But to do justice to the memory of so learned a Man as *Peta-vius*, the Bishop of *Meaux* told me, discoursing with him once on this subject, that in the last Edition he made of his Works, he retracted this opinion, which I am willing to believe upon the Authority of that great Man, whose admirable Talents, as well as particular Favours challenge a great deal of respect and esteem from me, which I shall always pay him, tho' he is an adversary to the Religion I profess. By this judge what pitiful Shifts your great *Goliaths* have been reduced to, when they have found themselves oppressed by the weight of Truth. Christ's being consubstantial with the Father, was believed long before the Council of *Nice*; 'twas no new Doctrine invented by them, but only declared by them, to be, and to have been the belief of the Church. You have hinted at the great advantages of the Doctrine of *Infallibility* in order to the suppressing of Schisms and Heresies, but they are only so in speculation. Your Church it self does not think it sufficient for that purpose, or else she is very uncharitable to make use of the severer method of an Inquisition, and upon all occasions to call for the assistance of the temporal Sword, as the surest means to suppress them. No, he that is disposed

in

in mind to receive the decisions of any Church as infallible without judging of them, is much likelier to fall into Heresie, than he who thinks all such determinations must be examined by Scripture and primitive Antiquity; since by this privilege the Pope, and his Faction challenge of interpreting God's Laws without Error, 'tis easie for them to impose what they please, the power of making Laws, and the sole power of interpreting them being much akin. You add one thing more, that no Protestant can deny but *that the State of the Church would be much better in being secured from Error in her decisions, and therefore we cannot think but that Christ who did all things well, would do that which is best for his Church.* I think it is much safer arguing the contrary way, that Christ has not establish'd any such power, and that therefore it is not best for the State of the Church. The ground of your Assertion is too presumptuous, that what seems fit to humane Reason, should seem fit to the infallible Judgment of God. 'Tis our Duty to be thankful for those means God has left us to work out our Salvation; and not to conclude he hath done that which he hath not done, because our shallow Capacities judge it fit to be done. But what art thou, O Man! that objectest against God.

Christ has left us such excellent Precepts of Modesty, Humility, Patience, Christian forbearance and Charity, that the practice of them would make us much sooner agree than any new method you can propose; at least if we do not agree they will inspire us with such a noble temper as heartily to compassionate one another, to live amicably and friendly together, and not be pulling out one anothers Eyes, because we do
not

not see things the same way. This is what I would have always different Parties zealous in, for there is nothing wanting very often to extinguish ill will, but an opportunity for Men to converse lovingly together, by which they will quickly perceive they are not such Monsters as they are represented to one another at a distance.

This I endeavour, according to my weakness, to practise my self; this I inculcate into all my Friends; that if we cannot agree in our Opinions, yet to take care that they do not rob us of our Charity, and love of one another, which in the sight of God is of great price.

You see what a long Letter you have drawn upon your self; it would have been disrespectful to you, as well as to Truth, to have neglected an Answer, and therefore I don't think my self oblig'd to make any Apology. Tho' if you had known how much I have been surfeited with Controversies upon a melancholly occasion, you would accept of this small attempt as a favour. I am,

S I R,

Your Faithful Humble Servant,

Florence, 26.

Dec. 1690.

R. NELSON.

FINIS.

APPENDIX.

P A P. I.

Mr. Herbert Thorndikes *Judgment of the Church of Rome, as it was delivered by him in a Paper to a Lady a little before his Death, taken from the printed Copy in the 85th page of a Book intituled, Several Conferences between a Romish Priest, a Fanatick Chaplain, and a Divine of the Church of England, &c. London, printed 1679.*

1. **T**He truth of the Christian Religion, and of the Scripture is presupposed to the Being of a Church.

And therefore cannot depend upon the Authority of it.

2. The *Church of Rome* maintains the Decrees of the present Church to be Infallible, which is false, and yet concerns the Salvation of all that believe it.

Therefore no Man can submit to the Authority of it.

A a

3. The

A P P E N D I X.

3. The *Church of Rome* in *St. Jerome's* time, did not make void the Baptism of those Sects which did not baptise in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

But that *Baptism* is void, and true Baptism necessary to Salvation.

Therefore the *Church of Rome* may err in matters of Salvation.

4. The *Church of Rome* may err in *Schism*, following the wrong cause. If you except only things necessary to Salvation to be believed. This shews that Infallibility only in things necessary to Salvation is not enough. It is destructive to Salvation to follow the wrong Cause in Schism.

Instance. The Schism with the *Greek Church* for Appeals to *Rome*. For there is evident Tradition to the contrary.

5. The *Church of Rome* enjoyns *Apochyphal Scriptures* to be esteemed *Canonical Scriptures*.

But this Injunction is contrary to *Tradition* and *Truth*, and concerns the Salvation of all that receive it.

6. The *Church of Rome* in *St. Jerome's* time did not receive the *Epistle* to the *Hebrews* for *Canonical Scripture*, as now it doth, and as in truth it is.

Therefore the *Church of Rome* may err in declaring the Authority of Scripture.

7. The *Church of Rome* doth err in teaching that attrition is turned into contrition by submitting to the power of the Keys;

But this Error is destructive to the Salvation of all that believe it.

Therefore it may err in matters necessary to Salvation.

That it is an Error. Because of the condition of Remission of Sins, which is before the Being

A P P E N D I X.

Being of a Church; and therefore cannot depend on the Authority of the Church.

8. The Church of Rome enjoyneth to believe *Transubstantiation*, and to profess that which is false. For there is Scripture and Tradition for the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist; but neither Scripture, nor Tradition for *Transubstantiation*, viz. for abolishing the Elements,

But the Church of Rome enjoyns to believe it.

Therefore it enjoyns to believe that for which there is neither Tradition nor Scripture.

Witness the Fathers that own the Elements after Consecration.

9. The Council of Trent enjoyneth to believe that Christ instituted a new Passover to be sacrificed as well as represented, commemorated, and offered in the Eucharist, *de Sacrific. Missæ, cap. 1.* which is false,

For the Sacrifice of Christ's Cross is commemorated, represented and offered as ready to be slain in and by the Eucharist; but not slain, and therefore not sacrificed in it and celebrating it.

And therefore when it is said there, c. 11. *Quod in Missa Christus incruentè immolatur*, if it be meant properly, it is a contradiction; for that which hath Blood is not sacrificed but by shedding the Blood of it; if figuratively, it signifies no more than that which I have said, that it is represented, commemorated and offer'd as slain.

And therefore all parts agreeing to this, the Church of Rome requiring more is guilty of the Schism, that comes by refusing it. For the propitiation of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist is the propitiation of Christ's Cross purchased for them that are qualified.

APPENDIX.

10. The *Council of Trent* commends the Mass without the Communion, *cap. 6.* wherein it eneth,

For the Communion being the restoring of the Covenant of Baptism after sin, the want of it, without the desire of it, is to be lamented not commended; as destructive of the means of Salvation.

11. There is neither Scripture nor Tradition for praying to Saints departed, or any evidence that they hear our Prayers.

Therefore it evidences a carnal hope that God will abate of the Covenant of our Baptism, which is the condition of our Salvation, for their sakes.

12. To pray to them for those things which only God can give (as all Papists do) is by the proper sense of their words downright Idolatry.

If they say their meaning is by a figure only to desire them to procure their requests of God; How dare any Christian trust his Soul with that Church, which teaches that which must needs be Idolatry in all that understand not the Figure?

13. There is neither Scripture nor Tradition for worshiping the *Cross*, the *Images* and *Reliques* of *Saints*,

Therefore it evidences the same carnal hope, that God will abate of his Gospel for such Bribes. Which is the Will-worship of *Masses*, *Pilgrimages*, and *Indulgences* to that purpose.

14. Neither Scripture nor Tradition is there for the removing any Soul out of Purgatory unto the *Beatifical Vision* before the day of Judgment.

Therefore the same carnal hope is seen in the Will-worship of *Masses*, *Indulgences*, *Pilgrimages*,

APPENDIX.

grimaces, and the like, for that purpose :
And that destructive to the Salvation of all
that believe that the guilt of their sins is ta-
ken away by submitting to the *Keys* before
they be contrite ; and the temporal penalty
remaining in *Purgatory* paid by these *Will-*
worships.

15. Both *Scripture* and *Tradition* condemn the
deposing of Princes, and acquitting their Subjects
of their *Allegiance*, and enjoining them to take
Arms for them whom the *Pope* substitutes.

And this Doctrine is not only false, but in my
Opinion properly *Heresie*, yet practised by
so many *Popes*.

The Church may be divided, that *Salvation*
may be had on both sides.

Instances. The *Schisms* of the *Popes*. The
Schism of *Acacius*. The *Schism* between the
Greeks and the *Latins*.

I hold the *Schism* for the *Reformation* to be of
this kind.

But I do not allow *Salvation* to any that shall
change, having these reasons before him ;
tho' I allow the *Reformation* not to be per-
fect in some points of less moment, as *prayer*
for the dead, and others.

Remember always that the *Popish Church* of
England can never be Canonically governed
being immediately under the *Pope*.

16. There is both *Scripture* and *Tradition* for
the *Scriptures* and *Service* in a known *Tongue* ;
and for the *Eucharist* in both *kinds*.

How then can any Christian trust his Soul with
that Church, which hath the conscience to
bar him of such helps provided by God ?

APPENDIX.

P A P. II.

Mr. Chillingworth's * *Letter of the Infallibility of the Church of Rome, or of that Doctrine which teaches the Roman Church to be the Guide of Faith, taken from the printed Copy in the Preface to a Book entituled, Certamen Religiosum, or, a dispute between a Papist, and a Protestant, &c. Oxford, printed 1704.*

S I R,

GIVE me leave to think it strange, and not far from a Prodigy, That this Doctrine of the *Roman Church* being the *Guide of Faith*, (if it be true Doctrine) should not either be known to the *Four Evangelists*, or if it were known to them, that being wise and good Men, they should either be so envious of the Church's Happiness, or so forgetful of the Work they took in hand (which was to write the whole Gospel of *Christ*) as that not so much as One of them should mention, so much as once, this so necessary a part of the Gospel, without the belief whereof there is no Salvation, and with the belief whereof (unless Men are snatch'd away by sudden Death) there can

* See also his Discourses against the Infallibility of the *Roman Church* among the additional Discourses of Mr. Chillingworth, printed at the end of his Works, in 4°. 1687.

hardly

A P P E N D I X.

hardly be any Damnation. It is evident, they do all of them speak with one consent very plainly in many things of small importance in comparison thereof, and is it credible (or indeed possible) that without Consent, or rather a Conspiracy, they should be so deeply silent concerning this *Unum Necessarium*, One Thing Necessary? You may believe it, if you can, for my part I cannot, unless I see demonstration for it. For if you say, they send us to the Church, and consequently to the Church of *Rome*, this is to suppose that which can never be proved, That the Church of *Rome* is the only Church; and without this supposal upon any Division of the Church, I am as far to seek for a Guide of my Faith as ever. As for Example, In the great Division of the Church, when the whole World wondered (saith St. *Jerom*) that it was become an *Arian*, when *Liberius* Bishop of *Rome* (as St. *Athanasius*, St. *Jerom*, and St. *Hilary* testify) subscribed to the Herefie, and joyned in Communion with them. Or in the Division of the *Greek* and *Roman* Churches, about the Procession of the Holy Ghost, when either side was the Church to it self, and each Heretical and Schismatical to the other; What direction could I, an ignorant Man, have then found from that Text of Scripture, (*Unless he hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an Heathen, or a Publican*) or (*Upon this Rock will I build my Church, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.*) Again, Give me leave to wonder, that neither St. *Paul* writing to the *Romans*, should not so much as intimate this their Privilege of *Infallibility*, but rather on the contrary put them in fear (in the 11th Chap.) *That they as well as the Jews, are in danger of falling away.* That St. *Peter*, the pretended Doctor of *Rome*, writing

A P P E N D I X.

two *Catbolick* Epistles mentioning his departure, should not so much as *once* acquaint the Christians, whom he writes to, what *Guide* they were to follow after he was taken away. That all the Writers of the *New Testament* should so frequently forewarn Men of *Hereticks*, *false Christs*, and *false Prophets*, and not arm them *once* with letting them know this only sure means of avoiding them. That so great a part of the *New Testament* should be employed about *Antichrist*, and so little, or indeed none at all, about the *Vicar of Christ*, and *Guide of the Faithful*. That our Saviour should leave this only means of ending Controversies, and yet speak so obscurely, and ambiguously of it, that now our *Judge*, or *Guide* is become the greatest Controversie, and hinderance of ending them. That there should be better Evidence in Scripture to entitle the *King* to this Office, who disclaims, than the *Pope*, who pretends to it. That *St. Peter* should never exercise any *one* act of Jurisdiction over the Apostles, nor they ever give him *one* Title, or Authority over them. That if the Apostles did know, that *St. Peter* was made *Head* of them, when our Saviour said (*Thou art Peter, &c.*) they should still contend, who should be the First; and that our Saviour should never tell them, that *Peter* was the Man. That *St. Paul* should say, *He was in nothing inferiour to the chief Apostles*. That the *Catechumenists* in the primitive Church, should never be taught this Foundation of their Faith, *That the Church of Rome was the Guide of it*. That the Fathers, *Tertullian*, *St. Jerome*, and *Optatus*, when they flew highest in commendation of the *Roman Church*, should attribute no more to Her, than to all other *Apostolical Churches*. That in the Controversie about *Easter*, the

Bishops

A P P E N D I X.

Bishops and Churches of *Asia* should be so ill catechiz'd, as not to know this Principle of Christian Religion, *The necessity of Conformity in Doctrine with the Church of Rome*, nor should ever be press'd with any such Conformity, in all things, but only with the particular Tradition of the *Western Churches*. That *Irenaeus*, and many other Bishops (notwithstanding *Ad hanc Ecclesiam necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam*) should not yet think it necessary Doctrine, or a sufficient ground of *Excommunication*, which the Church of *Rome* thought to be so. That *St. Cyprian*, and the Bishops of *Africa*, should be so ill-instructed in their Faith, as not to know this Foundation of it: That they likewise were never urged with any such Necessity of Conformity with the Church of *Rome*, nor ever charged with Heresie, or Error, for denying it. That when *Liberius* joyn'd with the *Arians* in Communion, and subscribed to their Heresie, the *Arians* should not then be the Church and Guide of Faith. That never Hereticks, for Five Ages after Christ, were press'd with this Argument of the *Infallibility* of the Church of *Rome*; or charged with the denial of it, as a distinct Heresie; so that *Aeneas Sylvius* should have cause to say, *Ante tempora Concilii Niceni quisque sibi vivebat, & parvus respectus habebatur ad Ecclesiam Romanam*. That the Ecclesiastical Story of those Times mentions no Acts of Authority of the Church of *Rome* over other Churches; as if there should be a *Monarchy*, and the King for some Ages together exercise no Jurisdiction in it. That to supply this defect, the *Decretal Epistles* should be so impudently forg'd, which in a manner speak nothing else but *Reges & Monarchas*, I mean the *Pope's* making Laws for, and exercising Authority over all other Churches. That

Vincentius

APPENDIX.

Vincentius Lirinensis seeking for a *Guide* of his *Faith*, and a *Preservative* from *Hereſie*, ſhould be ſo ignorant of this ſo ready a one, *The Infallibility of the Church of Rome*. Nay, that the *Popes* themſelves ſhould be ſo ignorant of the true ground of this their *Authority*, as to pretend to it, not upon *Scripture* and *Univerſal Tradition*, but upon a pretended imaginary hint of ſuch a *Canon* of the *Council of Nice*.

All theſe things, and many more, are very ſtrange to me, if the *Infallibility* of the *Church of Rome* be indeed, and was always acknowledg'd by *Chriſtians*, *The Foundation* of our *Faith*. And therefore I beſeech you pardon me, if I chooſe to build mine upon One that is much firmer and ſafer, and lies open to none of theſe *Objections*, which is *Scripture*, and *Univerſal Tradition*. And if one that is of this *Faith* may have leave to do ſo, I will ſubſcribe my ſelf

Your loving and true Friend,

CHILLINGWORTH.

PAP.

APPENDIX.

P A P. III.

The Creed of Pope Pius IV.

After having recited the Nicene Creed,
the following Articles are thus con-
tinued, viz.

13. **A** Postolicas & Ec-
clesiasticas Tra-
ditiones reliquasque e-
jusdem Ecclesie observa-
tiones & constitutiones
firmissimè admitto & am-
plector.

14. Item Sacram Scrip-
turam juxta eum sen-
sum quem tenuit & re-
net Sancta Mater Eccle-
sia, cujus est judicare
de vero sensu & in-
terpretatione Sacrarum
Scripturarum admitto;
nec eam unquam nisi
juxta unanimem consen-
sum Patrum accipiam &
interpretabor.

15. Profiteor quoque
septem esse verè & pro-
priè Sacramenta nova
legis à Jesu Christo Do-
mino nostro instituta, at-
que ad salutem humani
generis,

13. **I** Most firmly re-
ceive and em-
brace the Apostolical
and Ecclesiastical Tradi-
tions, and all the other
Observances and Con-
stitutions of the same
Church.

14. I do receive the
Holy Scriptures in the
same sense that Holy
Mother Church doth,
and always hath, to
whom it belongs to
judge of the true sense
and interpretation of
them; neither will I
receive and interpret
them otherways than
according to the unani-
mous consent of the Fa-
thers.

15. I do also profess,
that there are seven Sa-
craments of the new
Law truly and properly
so called, instituted by
our Lord Jesus Christ,
and

APPENDIX.

generis, licet non omnia singulis; necessaria, scilicet, Baptismum, Confirmationem, Eucharistiam, Pœnitentiam, Extremam Unctionem, Ordinem & Matrimonium, illaque gratiam conferre; & ex his Baptismum, Confirmationem & Ordinem sine Sacrilegio reiterari non posse. Receptos quoque & approbatos Ecclesia Catholica Ritus, in supradictorum omnium Sacramentorum, solemnè Administratione recipio & admitto.

16. *Omnia & singula quæ de peccato Originali & de Justificatione in Sacro-Sancta Tridentina Synodo definita & declarata fuerunt amplector & recipio.*

17. *Profiteor pariter in Missa offerri Deo verum, proprium & propitiatorium Sacrificium pro vivis & defunctis; atque in sanctissimo Eucharistia Sacramenta esse verè, realiter & substantialiter Corpus & Sanguinem,*

and necessary to the Salvation of Mankind, though not all of them to every one, viz. Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders and Marriage, and that they do confer Grace; and that of these, Baptism, Confirmation and Orders, may not be repeated without Sacrilege. I do also receive and admit the received and approved Rites of the Catholick Church in the solemn Administration of the above-said Sacraments.

16. I do embrace and receive all and every thing that hath been defined and declared by the holy Council of Trent, concerning Original Sin and Justification.

17. I do also profess, that in the Mass there is offered a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice for the Quick and the Dead; and that in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, there is truly, really

and

guine
& I
Nost
fieri
tius
Corpe
stant
nem
nem
Tran
appe

11
alter
totus
Chri
cran

I
Pur
mas
deli
var

2
dos
nan
inv
Ora
bis
run
ran

APPENDIX.

*guinem, und cum Anima
 Et Divinitate Domini
 Nostri Jesu Christi;
 fierique conversionem to-
 tius substantiæ panis in
 Corpus Et totius sub-
 stantiæ Vini in Sangui-
 nem; quam conversio-
 nem Catholica Ecclesia
 Transubstantiationem
 appellat.*

18. *Eateor etiam sub
 altera tantum Specie,
 totum atque integrum
 Christum verumque Sa-
 cramentum sumi.*

19. *Constanter teneo
 Purgatorium esse, ani-
 masque ibi detentas fi-
 delium Suffragiis ju-
 vari.*

20. *Similiter Et San-
 ctos und cum Christo reg-
 nantes, venerandos atque
 invocandos esse, eosque
 Orationes Deo pro no-
 bis offerre, atque eo-
 rum reliquias esse vene-
 randas.*

21. *Fir-*

and substantially, the
 Body and Blood, toge-
 ther with the Soul and
 Divinity of our Lord
 Jesus Christ; and that
 there is a change made
 of the whole substance
 of Bread into the Body,
 and of the whole sub-
 stance of Wine into the
 Blood; which change
 the Catholick Church
 calls Transubstantiation.

18. I confess also,
 that under one Kind
 only, whole and entire
 Christ, and a true Sacra-
 ment, is taken and re-
 ceived.

19. I do firmly hold,
 that there is a Purgato-
 ry, and that the Souls
 there detained are re-
 lieved by the Suffrages
 of the Faithful.

20. I do likewise be-
 lieve, that the Saints
 reigning together with
 Christ, are to be wor-
 shipped and prayed un-
 to, and that they do of-
 fer Prayers unto God
 for us, and that their
 Relicks are to be had
 in veneration.

21. I do

A P P E N D I X.

21. *Firmissimè assero, Imagines Christi, ac Dei pare semper Virginis, necnon aliorum Sanctorum habendas & retinendas esse, atque eis debitum honorem ac venerationem impertiendam.*

22. *Indulgentiarum etiam potestatem à Christo in Ecclesia relictam fuisse, illarumque usum Christiano populo maximè salutarem esse, affirmo.*

23. *Sanctam Catholicam & Apostolicam Romanam Ecclesiam, omnium Ecclesiarum Matrem & Magistram agnosco; Romanoq; Pontifici, Beati Petri, Apostolorum Principis, ac Jesu Christi Vicario, veram obedientiam spondeo ac juro.*

24. *Cetera item omnia à sacris Canonibus, & œcumenicis Conciliis, ac præcipuè à sacrosancta Tridentina Synodo tradita, definita & declarata indubitanter recipio*

21. I do most firmly assert, that the Images of Christ, and of the ever Virgin Mother of God, and of the other Saints, ought to be had and retained, and that due Honour and Veneration ought to be given to them.

22. I do affirm, that the power of Indulgences was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is very beneficial to Christian People.

23. I do acknowledge, the holy Catholic and Apostolick Roman Church to be the Mother and Mistress of all Churches; and I do promise and swear true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, the Successor of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ.

24. I do also without the least doubt, receive and profess all other things which have been delivered, defined and declared by the sacred Canons and œcumenical Councils,

recip
simu
nia
cunq
nata
them
riter
anat
ram
extr
vns
prej
teor
eam
viol
tren
conf
juve
conf
sub
rum
ner
ri,
qua
cur
spo
Sic
hæc
gel

A P P E N D I X.

recipio atque profiteor; simulque contraria omnia atque Hereses quas-cunque ab Ecclesia dam-natas, rejectas & ana-thematizatas, ego pa-riter damno, rejicio & anathematizo. Hanc ve-ram Catholicam fidem, extra quam nemo sal-vus esse potest, quam in præsentì spontè profi-teor, & veraciter teneo, eandem integram & in-violatam, usque ad ex-tremum vitæ spiritum constantissimè (Deo ad-juvante) retineri & confiteri, atque à meis subditis, vel illis quo-rum cura ad me in mu-nere meo spectabit tene-ri, doceri & prædicari, quantum in me erit, curaturum, ego idem N. spondeo, voveo, ac juro. Sic me Deus adjuvet & hæc Sancta Dei Evan-gelia.

Councils, and especially by the holy Synod of Trent; and all things contrary thereunto, and all Heresies whatsoever condemned, rejected and anathematized by the Church, I do likewise condemn, reject and a-nathematize. This true Catholick Faith, with-out which no Man can be saved, which at this time I freely profess, and truly em-brace, I will be careful (by the help of God,) that the same be retain-ed, and firmly profes-sed whole and inviolate as long as I live; and that as much as in me lies, that it be held, taught and preach'd by those under my power, and by such as I shall have charge over in my Profession. I the said N. promise, vow and swear: So help me God, and these his holy Gospels.

APPENDIX.

P A P. IV.

A Paper concerning the Differences in the chief Points of Religion betwixt the Church of Rome, and the Church of England, written to the late Countess of Peterborough, by Dr. John Cosins, afterwards Lord Bishop of Durham.

The Differences in the chief Points of Religion, between the Roman Catholicks and us of the Church of England; together with the Agreements which we for our parts profess and are ready to embrace, if they for theirs were as ready to accord with us in the same.

The DIFFERENCES.

WE that profess the Catholick Faith and Religion in the Church of England, do not agree with the Roman Catholicks in any thing whereunto they now endeavour to convert us. But we totally dissent from them (as they do from the Ancient Catholick Church) in these points.

1. That the Church of Rome is the Mother and Mistress of all other Churches in the World.

2. That the Pope of Rome is the Vicar-General of Christ: Or that he hath an Universal Jurisdiction

A P P E N D I X.

dition over all Christians that shall be saved.

3. That either the Synod of Trent was a General Council; or that all the Canons thereof are to be received as matters of Catholick Faith under pain of Damnation.

4. That Christ hath instituted seven true and proper Sacraments in the New Testament, neither more nor less, all conferring Grace, and all necessary to Salvation.

5. That the Priests offer up our Saviour in the Mass, as a real, proper and propitiatory Sacrifice for the quick and the dead, and that whosoever believes it not, is eternally damn'd.

6. That in the Sacrament of the Eucharist the whole substance of Bread is converted into the substance of Christ's Body, and the whole substance of Wine into his Blood, so truly and properly, as that after Consecration there is neither any Bread nor Wine remaining there, which they call Transubstantiation, and impose upon all Persons under pain of Damnation to be believed.

7. That the Communion under one kind is sufficient and lawful (notwithstanding the Institution of Christ under both) and that whosoever believes or holds otherwise is damned.

8. That there is a Purgatory after this Life, wherein the Souls of the dead are punished, and from whence they are fetch'd out by the Prayers and Offerings of the Living: And that there is no Salvation possibly to be had by any that will not believe as much.

9. That all the old Saints departed, and all those dead Men and Women, whom the Pope hath of late canoniz'd for Saints, or shall hereafter do so, whosoever they be, are and ought

A P P E N D I X

to be invocated by the Religious Prayers and Devotions of all Persons, and that they who do not believe this as an Article of their Catholick Faith cannot be saved.

10. That the Reliques of all these true or reputed Saints ought to be religiously worshipped, and that whosoever holdeth the contrary is damned.

11. That the Images of Christ and the blessed Virgin, and of the other Saints, ought not only to be had and retained, but likewise to be honoured and worshipped, according to the use and practices of the Roman Church; and that this is to be believed as of necessity to Salvation.

12. That the power and use of Indulgences, as they are now practised in the Church of Rome, both for the Living and the Dead, is to be received and held of all under pain of eternal Perdition.

13. That all the Ceremonies used by the Roman Church in the Administration of the Sacrament (such as are Spittle and Salt in Baptism, the five Croffes upon the Altars, and Sacrament of the Eucharist, the holding of that Sacrament over the Priest's head to be adored, the exposing of it in their Churches to be worshipped by the People, the circumgestation and carrying of it abroad in Procession upon their *Corpus Christi* day and to their Sick for the same, the Oyl and Chrism in Confirmation, the anointing of the Ears, the Eyes and Noses, the Hands and Reins of those that are ready to dye; the giving of an empty Chalice and Paten, to them that are to be ordained Priests, and many others of this nature now in use with them) are of necessity to Salvation, to be approved and admitted by all other Churches.

14. That

A P P E N D I X.

14. That all the Ecclesiastical Observations and Constitutions of the same Church (such as are their Laws of forbidding all Priests to Marry; the appointing several Orders of Monks, Friars and Nuns in the Church; the Service of God in an unknown Tongue, the saying of a number of *Ave Maria's* by tale upon their Chaplets, the sprinkling of themselves and the dead Bodies with Holy Water, as operative and effectual to the Remission of venial Sins, the distinctions of Meats to be held for true Fasting, the religious Consecration and incensing of Images, the baptizing of Bells, the dedicating of divers Holy-days for the immaculate Conception, and the bodily Assumption of the blessed Virgin; and for *Corpus Christi*, or Transubstantiation of the Sacrament; the making of the Apocryphal Books to be as Canonical as any of the rest of the holy and undoubted Scriptures, the keeping of those Scriptures from the free use and reading of the People, the approving of their own Latin Translation only, and divers other matters of the like nature) are to be approved, held and believed as needful to Salvation, and that whoever approves them not, is out of the Catholick Church, and must be damned.

All which, in their several respects, we hold some to be pernicious, some unnecessary, many false, and many fond, and none of them to be imposed upon any Church or any Christian, as the Roman Catholicks do upon all Christians, and all Churches whatsoever, for matters needful to be approved for eternal Salvation.

APPENDIX.

Our AGREEMENTS.

IF the Roman Catholicks would make the Essence of their Church (as we do ours) to consist in these following points, we are at accord with them: in the reception and believing of:

1. All the Two and Twenty Canonical Books of the Old Testament, and the Twenty Seven of the New, as the only Foundation and perfect Rule of our Faith.

2. All the Apostolical and Ancient Creeds, especially those which are commonly called the Apostles Creed, the Nicene Creed, and the Creed of *St. Athanasius*, all which are clearly deduced out of the Scriptures.

3. All the Decrees of Faith and Doctrine set forth as well in the first four General Councils, as in all other Councils, which those first four approved and confirmed, and in the 5th and 6th General Councils besides (than which we find no more to be General) and in all the following Councils that be thereunto agreeable, and in all the Anathema's or Condemnations given out by those Councils against Hereticks, for the defence of the Catholick Faith.

4. The unanimous and general Consent of the Ancient Catholick Fathers, and the Universal Church of Christ in the Interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, and the collection of all necessary matters of Faith from them during the first Six Hundred Years, and downwards to our own days.

5. In

A P P E N D I X.

5. In acknowledgment of the Bishop of *Rome*, if he would rule and be ruled by the ancient Canons of the Church, to be the Patriarch of the *West*, by right of Ecclesiastical and Imperial Constitution, in such places where the Kings and Governours of those places had received him, and found it behooful for them to make use of his Jurisdiction, without any necessary dependence upon him by divine Right.

6. In the reception and use of the two blessed Sacraments by our Saviour; in the confirmation of those Persons that are to be strengthened in their Christian Faith, by Prayer and Imposition of Hands, according to the examples of the holy Apostles and ancient Bishops of the Catholick Church; in the publick and solemn Benediction of Persons, that are to be joyned together in holy Matrimony; in publick or private absolution of penitent Sinners; in the consecrating of Bishops, and the ordaining of Priests and Deacons for the Service of God in his Church by a *lawful* Succession; and in visiting the Sick, by praying for them, and administering the blessed Sacrament to them, together with a final absolution of them from their repented Sins.

7. In commemorating at the Eucharist the sacrifice of Christ's Body and Blood once truly offered for us.

8. In acknowledging his sacramental, spiritual, true and real Presence there to the Souls of all them, that come faithfully and devoutly to receive him according to his own Institution in that holy Sacrament.

9. In giving thanks to God for them, that are departed out of this Life in the true Faith of Christ's Catholick Church, and in praying to God that they may have a joyful Resurrection, and a

A P P E N D I X.

perfect Consummation of Bliss, both in their Bodies and Souls in his Eternal Kingdom of Glory.

10. In the Historical and Moderate Use of painted and true Stories, either for Memory or Ornament, where there is no danger to have them abused or worshipped with Religious Honour.

11. In the use of Indulgences, or abating the rigour of the Canons imposed upon Offenders according to their Repentance, and their want of ability to undergo them.

12. In the Administration of the Two Sacraments, and other Rites of the Church with Ceremonies of Decency and Order, according to the Precept of the Apostle, and the free Practice of the Ancient Christians.

13. In observing such Holy Days and Times of Fasting, as were in use in the first Ages of the Church, or afterwards received upon just Grounds, by publick and lawful Authority.

14. Finally, in the reception of all Ecclesiastical Constitutions and Canons made for the ordering of our Church; or others, which are not repugnant either to the Word of God, or the Power of Kings, or the Laws established by right Authority in any Nation.

APPENDIX

De Officiis di-
urnalium noc-
turnalium ho-
parum.

* Of the Offices of
the Daily and
Nightly Hours
of Prayer.

GODEUND DEOF-
GOD is Geſet
on cyplicum þenun-
gum æfter canonec-
lican geþunan to
nyðþihte eallum geha-
debum

Divine Service is
appointed in the
Church Miniſtrations
according to Canonical
Custom, as a neceſſary
duty to all Men in Or-
ders.

* They are alſo called *Hora Canonica*, Canonical Hours, be-
ing Times ſet apart for Divine Service by the Eccleſiaſtical Ca-
nons, to be obſerved by ſuch Eccleſiaſtical Perſons as were
under this, or that Rule.

Concerning the number of theſe Hours of Devotion, the
ſeveral Authors differ, who write about them. Some fix up-
on the number Eight, dividing the Night and the Day, each
of them into four diſtinct Offices. Thoſe of the day, being
thus diſtinguiſh'd, viz. the *First, Third, Sixth, and Ninth*
Hours. The Night divided into *Evening Service, Completorium,*
Nocturns, and *Lauds*. This Number is defended by many. But
the generality of the *Fathers*, rather chuſe the Number *Seven*
as it is preſcribed in this Office, grounding alſo their choice up-
on the ſame words of Holy David, *Pſalm. 119, 164. Seven*
times a Day do I praife thee, becauſe of thy righteous Judgments.
And the Authority of David, who being a King, and much of
his time taken up in the Regal Adminiſtration, yet reſerv'd
ſo great a part of it for the Service of God, is not the only
thing urged to give Countenance to this Number; but there
are likewiſe ſeveral other Reaſons alledg'd from Scripture, as
that in the Prophet *Eſai, Chap. 11.* wherein are pointed out

A P P E N D I X.

bebum mannum. On ælcne timon man sceal god heþian. 7 on æl- cepe stope georne to gode clyþian. Ac þeah hƿæðene synðon ge- sette	ders. Men are at all Times to praise God, and in all places ear- nestly to call upon him. Nevertheless are there distinct Times set a- part
--	--

the seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost; 1. *The Spirit of Wisdom*, 2. *and understanding*, 3. *The Spirit of Counsel*, 4. *and Ghostly Strength*, 5. *The Spirit of Knowledge*, 6. *and Piety*, 7. *The Spirit of a Holy and Godly Fear*. Again, Our Old Adversary takes unto him seven other Spirits wickeder than himself, Mat. xii. 45. & Luk. xi. 26. against whom we shall not be able to prevail without the sevenfold Grace of the Holy Spirit; therefore, in order to obtain this sevenfold Grace, the Church has appointed that Men should offer up a sevenfold sacrifice of Praise to God. Furthermore, Prov. 24. v. 16. it is said, *A just Man falleth seven times a day, and riseth again*. There are likewise seven deadly Sins, and seven Abominations, Prov. 26. v. 25. Wherefore if any one would not fall into them, or having fallen into them would recover himself, he must praise God, and beg pardon seven times. Our Saviour has comprehended the Lord's Prayer in Seven Petitions, and God Almighty finish'd the Works which he created in seven Days. These seven Hours are also said to be represented by the seven Trumpets, at the sound whereof the Walls of Jericho fell down, Josh. 6. and by the seven Aspersions or Sprinklings, Levit. 14. 51. To these we may add the seven Stars, seven Churches, and seven Golden Candlesticks, Revel. Ch. 1. And in this point we may receive farther information from several of the Fathers: As namely, St. Basil, Greg. Nazianzen, St. Austin, St. Hierom, &c. to which you will be refer'd by such as treat of the Churches Rituals, See Durandus's *Rationals*, Durantus de *Ritibus Eccl. Cathol.* Bishop Cosin's *Hours*, &c.

And if we would know the Consent of the Saxon Church in this particular, we shall find in the *Excerptions* of Ecgbert Archbishop of York, in the Year 750. mention made of the seven Synaxes, Canon. 28. which seven Synaxes were appointed to be sung and observed in this manner; the first was the *Synaxis Nocturnal*, sung at Night; the second, the *first Hour* of the Day; the third, that they call'd the *third Hour*; the fourth, the *sixth Hour*; the fifth, the *ninth Hour*; the sixth, the *Vespers*; the seventh, *Completorium*. Spelman's *Counc.* Vol. I. p. 261.

And

APPENDIX.

sette timan gynðen-
lice to þam anum. ꝥ
gýr hya for byrgan
ofþon ne mæge. ꝥ he
hupu ꝥ nýðriht dægh-
pamlice gefýlle. eall
gpa David cwæð. Sep-
ties in die laudem dixi
tibi. Ðæt is reoþon ri-
ðon on dæg ic rang
ðe ðrihten to lofe. ⁊
to reoþdunge. to rel-
ðan hit bið. beo hit
aþelðop on dæg þæt
pe god heþian. þonne
reoþon riðum. Ðæt is
æne. æpeft on æpne
morgen.

part for these alone.
That if any one by rea-
son of Business, cannot
be more frequent, he
may at least be able
daily to fulfil this ne-
cessary Duty, in such
manner as *David* ex-
presses it, *Septies in die*
Laudes dixi tibi†; that
is, Seven times a day
have I sung, O Lord,
to thy Praise, and Ho-
nour. We do it too sel-
dom, if we praise God
less than seven Times a
Day. That is, Once
first of all ⁊ betimes in
the

And again in *Ælfrick's Canons ad Wulfinum Episcopum*, Ca-
non. 19. They are mention'd in this order; Uht-rang. ⁊
Prim-rang. Unden-rang. ⁊ miðbægrang. Non-
rang. ⁊ Efen-rang. ⁊ Niht-rang; where you see
all agree as to the number, tho' they differ in the order. Our Of-
fices ending with the Uht-rang, whereas they begin with it,
Spel. Concil. Vol. I. p. 577. See likewise the 15th Canon of
the Council of *Clovesho*, under *Cuthbert* Archbishop of *Canter-*
bury, p. 249. In *Regula Monachic Benedicte*, they are reckon'd
up in this manner, 1. Uht-rang. 2. Dægneðrang.
3. Prim-rang. 4. Unden-rang. 5. Miðbægrang.
6. Non-rang. 7. Efen-rang. and more Instances might
be added, but these may suffice.

† *Psal. 119. 164.*

1. On æpne Morgen, Early in the Morning, at Break
of Day, or the first Hour. Our Six a Clock in the Morning.
Being their First Hour in Old Times. From the Latin *Prima*
it is called *Prime*, and the Service *Primsang*, as *Chaucer* uses it,
in the Tale of the Nonnes Priest.

Er it was Prime.

APPENDIX.

Morgen. 7 eft on un- berntide. 7 on midne dag. 7 on non. 7 on æfen. 7 on fopan- night. 7 on uhtan ti- man.	the Morning, next at 2 Underntide, after that at 3 Mid-day, then at 4 Noon, next at 5 Even, at the 6 Forepart of the Night, and at 7 Mid- night,
--	---

2. Underntide. The third Hour of the Day. And
 þa he ut-eode embe underntide. i. e. He went out
 about the third Hour, *Matth. ch. 20. v. 3.* in the Francie,
 Unborn jum quam than than oc an unborn tuo.
 It answers to our Forenoon or Nine of the Clock. The word
 you meet with in *Bedes Eccl. Hist. lib. 4. c. 22.* Fram un-
 berntide þonne mon mæsse optort fingeð.
From the third Hour when the Mass is usually sung. And the
Liber Medicus, in the Royal Library at St. James's, mentions it
 among the three several times at which drink is permitted to be
 given; that is, on Unborn. on Middag. on Non.
 at Undern, at Mid-day, and at Noon. Chaucer also uses it,

Till it was passed undren of the Day.

But *Verstegan*, thorough mistake, determines it to the Afternoon,
 or towards Evening. See more in *Somner's Dictionary*.

3. Middag. Midday. Formerly the sixth Hour of the
 Day, and the Forenoon: But now is the same with our Noon,
 or Twelve a Clock.

4. Non. The ancient Noon, or *Hora Nona*. Their ninth
 Hour, but our three a Clock in the Afternoon. Agreeable to
 which is their Nonjang, the same with our three a Clock
 Prayers.

5. Æfen. Even. The twelfth Hour according to the
 old computation, probably so called because it equally divided
 the four and twenty Hours, and made the parts of the Civil
 Day even.

6. Fopannight. The beginning or forepart of the
 Night. I suppose it might be our nine a Clock at Night. And
 that from thence we have the continu'd Custom of a nine a
 Clock Bell, &c.

7. Uhtan. or Utan tid. Our midnight or twelve
 a Clock at Night. Perhaps so called because that then the four
 and twenty Hours were run out, and the Civil Day was com-
 plet;

A P P E N D I X.

man. Nis æppe æni-
ger mannes mæð. þæt
he cunne godes swa forð
gehepian swa he sýnðe
is. Ac hit is þeah upe
ealra þearf þe ge-
ornlice him þeopian.
⁊ ðenian. þæt ðe se
magon ⁊ cunnon.

night. It is not in the
power of any Man, to
know how to praise God
equally to his worth.
Yet is it the duty of
every one of us dili-
gently to Serve and
worship him, with our
best Abilities and Un-
derstanding.

DE *MATUTINALE
OFFICIO.

† Of the Morning Ser-
vice.

ON DÆGERED
MAN SEAL GOD
hepian.

At Day-break Men
ought to praise God, as
David

pleat; in the Gothic **nhtr** signifies the Morning,
and **𐌺𐌹𐌸𐌹** in the Runic Lexicon is *vigilia matutina*, the
Morning Watch, which will agree with the foregoing conje-
cture, for as soon as the four and twenty Hours are out, and
the Civil Day is finish'd, the Morning begins; for Example,
we say nine, ten, eleven, and twelve a Clock at Night, but
then begin again with one, two, three in the Morning. Un-
less it shall seem more reasonable to derive **nhtr**,
and **𐌺𐌹𐌸𐌹** or Uhtan, from **𐌺𐌹𐌸𐌹** *metuere*,
timere, to fear, which makes **nhtr**. *time-*
bant, they feared, *Marc. 11. 32.* Uhtis being the
dead time of the Night, which is usually very terrible, and
full of Horrour.

† Dæges, the Morning, or Break of Day, compounded
of Dæg. Day, and ges. as if you should say the red of the
Day. After this manner we find the ancient Poets often de-
scribing the Morning. *Homer* calls her, *Ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥως*,
the rosie finger'd Morn; others give her Horses of that colour;
and *Virgil* in his 3 *Aeneid* introduces her,

Jamq; rubescebat Stellis Aurora fugatis.

And now the rising Morn with rosie Light,

Adorns the Sky, and puts the Stars to flight. *Mr. Dryden.*

And she is sometimes call'd *Crocea* and *Aurora*, as being of a
Saffron and Golden Red. * So the MS.

APPENDIX.

heþuan. eall ſpa Da-
við cƿæð. ðeuf ðeuf
meuf að te ðe luce
vigilo. Ðæt iſ. min
ðrihten to þe ic paci-
ge of ſpurn leoht. ⁊
eƿt he cƿæð. In matu-
tiniſ domine medita-
bon in te. quia ſuſti-
adutor meuf. þæt iſ
on ðægneð ic ſmeabe
ymbre þe. ƿopðam þe
ðu ƿæne min ſultum.
Eriſt iſ ealler mancyn-
neſ ſultum. ⁊ ealler
miððancapðeſ helpenð.
on ðægneð hiſ geƿe-
arð þ ðurh goðeſ
mihte Moýſeſ gelæbbe
þ iſraheliſiſce folc of
egipta lanðe. eall un-
ſemine ofen ða nea-
ðan ſa. ⁊ aſter ðam
rona ſeo ſylfe ſa be-
ſencte ⁊ abſencte go-
ðeſ ƿiðerſinnan. pha-
raonem ⁊ eall hiſ ge-
genge. ⁊ on ðægneð
hiſ geƿearð þ Eriſt
of ðeaþe apar. ⁊ of
helle gelæbbe ealle ða
ðe he ƿolde. ⁊ hiſ ƿiðer-
ſinnan þæt iſ ðeopol
ſylfe he beſencte ⁊
ealle

David ſaith, || *Deus De-
us meus ad te de luce
vigilo*, that is, *My Lord,
I am awake to thee
from the firſt Light*.
And afterwards he ſays,
* *In matutinis Domine
meditabor in te, quia
fuisti adjutor meus*. That
is, At the dawning of
the Day I thought up-
on thee, for thou art
my Help. Chriſt is
the Helper of all Man-
kind, and the Uphold-
er of all the Earth. At
Day-break it was that
thorough God's Might,
Moses led all the Chil-
dren of *Israel* out of the
Land of *Egypt* unhurt,
over the Red Sea; and
ſoon after this, the ſelf
ſame Sea drowned and
overwhelmed God's E-
nemies, *Pharaoh* and all
his *Gang*. And it was
at break of Day that
Chriſt aroſe from death,
and led out of Hell all
that he would, and his
Adverſaries, the Devil
himſelf and his Com-
pany, he plunged in
the

|| *Pſal. 63. v. 1.*

* *Pſal. 63. v. 7.*

APPENDIX.

ealle his gegeng. on
helle furle. þy þe rculon
on dægnes god georne
heþian. 7 him a þancian
ðæne milðheortnyrre
þe he on mancynne þa
geþonhte. þa þa he hit
alyrte. of helle rite.
7 of deoples geþealde.
7 gepymde þanan forð
nihtne weg to heofona
rice. ælcum þara þe his
willan gepyncð. heþ on
life. Amen.

De prima hora.

ON DÆRE FOR-
MAN dægtide. þ̅ is
be sunnon up-gange þe
rculon god heþian 7
hine geornlice biððan.
þæt he þurh his milð-
heortnesse. mid so-
þne sunnon lihtinge
upe heortan alyhte. þ̅
is þæt he ðurh his
gyfe upe ingeþanc swa
alyhte. þ̅ is deopol of
nihtan wege þurh de-
menðe

the infernal Lake:
Therefore we shall at
break of Day praise
God diligently, and
thank him for that mer-
cifulness which he then
accomplish'd for Man-
kind, when he releas'd
them from the punish-
ment of Hell, and the
Power of the Devil, and
from that time laid o-
pen a right way to the
Kingdom of Heaven,
for all those who in this
Life do his Will. *Amen.*

* Of the First Hour.

At the first Time of
the Day, that is, at
Sun-rising Men are to
praise God, and ear-
nestly to beseech him,
That thorough his Mer-
cy he would with the
light of the true Son
enlighten our Hearts.
That is, that he tho-
rough his Grace would
so enlighten our Con-
sciences, that the Devil
by perillous Darkness
lead

* Concerning the first Hour, see more in the Notes upon
the Offices in General; as also in the Canons of *Theodore* Arch-
bishop of *Canterbury*, in the Year 668: which were afterwards
translated into Saxon by *Ælfric*; amongst which Canons, the
16th bears the Title *Be Ppungangum*, the Original MS.
is in *Bennet-College-Library* at *Cambridge*.

APPENDIX.

menðe ðýrta belaban
ne mæge. ne mib syn-
gnum to rýðe geh-
nemman.

Deus in adiutorium
meum intende. Domine
ad adiuuandum me pe-
rtina.

Ver drihten god.
Deope fultum be-
heals.

Drihten me.
Ans me hpaðe rýð-
ðan gefultuma.

Et populi prece.

Gloria Patri.
Sý þe fulðor 7 lof.
7 iðe geopenos.

Leons calle þeoba.

Danc 7 pylla.

Mægen 7 milose.

Ans caller mober lu-
fu roðfærtþa sib.

Ans ðiner sylfer
ðom.

Fopulðe geflitzegob.

Spa ðu pealban miht.

Call

lead us not out of the
right way, nor too of-
ten involve us in the
Snares of Sin.

Deus* in adiutorium
meum intende, domine ad
adiuandum me festina.

Look on me, O Lord,
With thy precious
Aid.

O Lord help me,
Oh be a ready Help
To me in time to
come,

When my Soul has
need.

Gloria Patri.
Be Glory and Praise
Divulged far and
wide.

Throughout all Na-
tions,

Thanksgiving and
good Will.

And Power and
Mercy,

And all kind of Cha-
rity

Among the Saints.

And thy own Judg-
ment

Apparent to the
World.

How thou canst com-
mand, The

* Psalm 7. v. 1.

APPENDIX.

Call eorðan mægen
 7 uplſte.

7 mō 7 ſolcna.

7 ealðe 7 eall on
 7 ſihte.

Patru 7 ſilio 7 ſpīritui
 7 ſancto.

Du eart 7 ſpōrpa 7 æ-
 ðe.

And 7 eoþh hýpðe.

Liſe 7 lætceop.

Leohter 7 ealðe.

7 ſýnðoð 7 ſpām 7 ſýn-
 num.

7 ſpā 7 ſin 7 ſunū mæne.

7 ſuph clane 7 gecýnð.

7 ſýning oþe ealle.

7 Bealð 7 gebletroð.

7 Boca læpeop.

7 Deah hige 7 ſpōrpe.

7 And halig 7 gart.

7 Sicut erat in p̄ncipi-
 o.

7 Spā 7 p̄r on 7 ſpuman.

7 Fp̄ea mancynner.

7 Ealpe 7 ſopulðe 7 ſihte.

7 And 7 ſpōrpe clane. 7
 7 c̄p̄a 7 ſihte.

7 Du 7 gecýðe 7 ſihte.

7 Ða 7 du ece 7 goð.

The ſtrength of all
 the Earth and Air,

The Wind and
 Clouds.

Thou juſtly ruleſt
 all.

*Patri, Filio, & Spiritui
 ſancto.*

Thou art Father of
 Comforts,

Pastor of the Soul,

Life's Conductor,

And the Lord of
 Light,

Separate from Sin,

Even ſo thy Noble
 Son

By nature pure

King over all.

Bleſſed Prince,

Learnings chief Ma-
 ſter,

Sublime comfort of
 the Soul,

And holy Spirit.

Sicut erat in principio.

As it was at Firſt,

Lord of Mankind,

Beauty of all the
 World,

And comfort pure.

And wiſe Providence.

Thou declaredſt that
 When thou Eternal

God,

Ana

Alone

APPENDIX.

Ana gepohtere.
 Ðu þu halige miht.

Deorðanar 7 eorðan
 Eaðar 7 uplyft.

And ealle þing þu
 sette on folc.
 Spýðe feala cynna.

And to rýnðroðert
 hig.
 Syððon on manega.
 Ðu gepohtere ece
 god.
 On six dagum.

Ealle gerceafta.

And on þone seorðan.
 Ðu geperte.

Ða wæs geporðað.
 Ðin wægepe weorc.

And ðu runnan sæg.

Sylf halgodert.
 And gemænrobert
 hine.

Manegum to helpe.
 Ðone heahan sæg.
 Deaðar 7 freoðar.

Alone didst create
 Through thy Holy
 Might.

The Heavens and the
 Earth;

And with Earth the
 Air,

And all things didst
 dispose on Earth,

Of various kinds,

And dividedst them,

Into several sorts.

Thou madest, Eternal
 God,

Within six Days
 space,

All created things,

And on the seventh
 Day,

Thou didst take thy
 rest,

For then finished
 Were thy beauteous
 Works;

And thou the Sun-
 day,

Thy self Hallowedst
 And magnifiedst it,

For the ease of many.
 That high Day

All keep and cele-
 brate,

Ealle

That

APPENDIX

Ealle þa ðe cun-
non. Epiſtene þeapap.
ðaligne heort leofan.

And ðar he hytan ge-
boð.

On drihtnes namon.
Se ðæg is gepurðoð.
Et nunc 7 remper.
And nu 7 ſymbles.

Ðine roðan peopc.

And ðin mycele
miht.

Manegum ſpytelað.

Spa þine cpaſtaſ heo.

Eyðap riðe.
Ope ealle populoð.
Ece ſtanðeþ.
Gober hand gepeopc.

Eropeð ſpa ðu here.

Ealle þe hepað.
ðalige ðneamar.
Clanpe ſteſne.
And cpiſtene bec.

Eall miððan eapð.
And pe men cpeðað.
On gunde heþ.
Gode lore 7 ðanc.

Ece pilla.

That know the Chri-
ſtian Rites.

Holy ſincere Devo-
tion,

And this moſt high
Command.

In our Lord's Name,
The Day is honoured.

Et nunc & ſemper.
And now, and al-
ways.

Thy true, and real
Works,

And thy manifold
Power

To many doth ap-
pear,

As it thy wiſe Pro-
vidence,

Manifeſteth wide
Over all the World.

Evermore doth ſtand
The handywork of

God,
Increaſeth as thou

promiſedſt,
All ſerve to thy praiſe.

The Holy Harmony,
With Voices ſweet,

The Book of Chri-
ſtian Truth.

All the Uniuerſe
And we Men declare,

Here upon the Earth,
Praiſe and Thanks to

God,
Thy Eternal Will,

And

C c

And

APPENDIX.

And ðin agen ðom.

Et in secula seculorum.

And on populsa þo
pulle þunað.

And nixað cýnnung
mnan pulþne.

And his þa gecope-
nan.

Deað þpýnnerre ha-
liger garter.

Þlitige englar.

And pulþon sýre.
Soðe ribbe.

Saþla þangung.
Moðermilcre.

Ðap. is reo marce
lurn.

Ðalig ðomay heoro-
nar rýndon.

Ðaph þine ecan.

Elghap pulle.

þpa rýndon þine
milca.

Opep midðan gearp.

Sputele 7 geryne.

þ þu hyrylc poph-
tert. Amen.

þe þæt roþlice fec-
gað ealle

þuph clene gecýns.

Eu

And thy Judgment
great.

Et in secula seculorum.

And from World to
World endures.

And King in Glory
Reigns,

And his own Elect,

The mysterious Tri-
nity of the Holy Spi-
rit.

Angels beautiful,

The Gift of Glory.

And perfect Peace.

Soul's thankfulness,

And Compassion of

Mind,

There is most tran-
scendent Love.

Heavens sacred Man-
sions are

Thro' thy wife en-
crease

Every where full

And the great Effects

Of thy mighty Pow-
er over all the Earth.

Plain and evident,

That thy self hast
made. Amen.

We that faithfully,

Do all declare,

That by Nature pure

Thou

APPENDIX.

Du eapt cýning on-
piht.

Elene 7 cparfig.
Du gecyððeƿt þ.
Ða þu mihtig ƿoð.

Man ƿeƿonhterz.
And him onbyðeƿt.

Opuð 7 ƿapul.
Sealdeƿt ƿoð 7 ge-
ƿit.

And ƿeƿma ƿacýnð.

Eyððeƿt þine cpar-
taƿ.

Spyle 7 Epiceƿ
miht.

HYMNUS.

Jam lucis orto ríde-
re deum precemur
supplices.

Deus in nomine tuo
saluum me fac 7 in
uirtute tua libera me.

On þinum þam hal-
ƿan naman ƿeðo me
halne. ƿoð alyƿ me
ƿƿam laðum þuƿh þin
leofe mæƿen ;

Regi autem seculo-
rum immortalí inui-
ribili

Thou art rightly
King,

Pure and Provident,
Thou declaredst that,
When thou mighty
God,

Man didst first create,
Thou didst breath in-
to him

Spirit and Soul,
Gavest him Speech
and Understanding,

And each kind of
Fruits,

Thy Wisdom thou
didst then reveal,

Such is the power of
Christ.

HYMNUS.

*Jam lucis orto fidere
deum precemur suppli-
ces.*

The Day-star being
risen, let us pray to
God humbly.

† Deus in nomine
tuo saluum me fac, &
in uirtute tua libera me.

In thy holy Name
make me safe, God de-
liver me from the
wicked, through thy
mighty Love.

Regi autem seculo-
rum immortalí inui-
bili

APPENDIX.

ribili soli Deo honor &
gloria in secula seculorum. Amen.

bili soli Deo Honor &
Gloria in secula seculorum. Amen.

† To the King of all
the World, Immortal
Invisible, to the only
God be Honour and
Glory for ever and e-
ver. Amen.

Deo gratias.

Thanks be to God.

Exsurge iesu fili Dei
unui cum sancto spiri-
tu miserepe nobis.

Christe Jesu fili Dei
vivi cum Sancto Spiritu
miserere nobis.

Christ Jesu Son of
the living God, with
the Holy Ghost have
mercy on us.

Qui sedes ad dextram
patris miserepe nobis.

Qui sedes ad dextram
patris miserere nobis.

Thou who sittest at
the right hand of the Fa-
ther have Mercy on us.

Gloria Patri.

Glory be to the Fa-
ther.

Exsurge iesu. Exsur-
ge Domine adiuua nos
& libera nos propter
nomen tuum.

Christe Jesu. Exsurge
Domine adiuua nos &
libera nos propter nomen
tuum.

Aris surgeten nu.

O Lord now arise,

Ans us pice ne do.

And to us quickly send,

Ferne fultum.

Thy friendly aid,

Ans us et peonsum
ahpebe.

And rid us from our

Fopson pe naman

Foes,

pinne.

Nybe

Because that we thy

Name

Love,

A P P E N D I X.

Nybe lufiað.	Love as in duty bound.
Lýppie leiron.	Lord have Mercy upon us,
Epirte leiron.	Christ have Mercy upon us,
Lýppie leiron.	Lord have Mercy upon us.
Pater noster qui es in celis.	<i>Pater noster qui es in Cælis.</i>
Fæben mancýnner.	Father of Mankinds
Froþner ic þe biððe.	Comfort, I thee pray.
halig ðrihten.	Holy Lord
Ðu þe on heofonum eart.	Thou that in Heaven art.
Sanctificetur nomen tuum.	<i>Sanctificetur nomen tuum.</i>
Ðæt jy gehalgod.	That hallowed may be,
hyge cnæptum fært.	With our Souls utmost care,
Ðin nama nu ða.	Thy Name even now,
Nepiende Epirte.	Redeemer Christ,
In upum pephð locan.	And in our Souls recess,
Fæste gertaðelod.	Be most deeply fixt.
Adueniat regnum tuum.	<i>Adueniat regnum tuum.</i>
Eume nu to mannum.	That now may come to Men,
Mihtra fealdeno.	O Lord of Might,
Ðin rice to us.	Thy Kingdom even to us.
Rihtir ðema.	Thou Righteous Judge,
And ðin geleafa in luf þæge.	And thy lively Faith
On upum mobe.	Upon our Minds,
Mæpe	C c 3 Ever

APPENDIX.

Wæne þu þu punige.	Ever plenteously abide.
Fiat uoluntas tua sicut in celo ⁊ in terra.	<i>Fiat uoluntas tua sicut in Cælo ⁊ in Terra.</i>
And þu willa mið uꝛ.	And thy will with us
ƿe on ðe gelaſceð.	Be here accomplished,
On eardunge eorðan ƿiceꝛ.	In the dwelling-place
Spa hluttror iꝛ.	Of thy earthly Kingdom,
In heoron ƿulðne.	With equal Purity,
ƿynnun ge ƿlite goð.	As 'tis in Heavens Glory.
A to ƿopulð ƿopð.	With Blessedness adorn'd
Panem nostrum cotidianum ða nobis hoðie.	To the World's end.
Syle uꝛ nu to ðage.	<i>Panem nostrum cotidianum ða nobis hoðie.</i>
Drihten gumena.	And give us now to day
Deopena heah cýning.	Lord of all Mankind,
Blas upne.	Heavens King most High,
Done ðu onrenbert.	Our daily Bread.
Seapum to hæle.	Which thou sendest down
On miððan eapð.	For our Souls relief
ƿanna cýnnieꝛ.	To Mankind on Earth.
Ðæt iꝛ re clæna Eriſt.	That is spotless Christ
Drihten Goð.	The Lord our God.
Et dimitte nobis debita nostra.	<i>Et dimitte nobis debita nostra.</i>
Forgif uꝛ gumena ƿeapð.	Pardon, Man's Protector,
Lyltar	All

APPENDIX

Gyltas 3 synna.
 And ure leahþay a-
 let.
 Lices punþa 3 man-
 þæta.
 Ðra pe milþum.
 7iððe ælmihtigum
 goðe.
 Opt abylgæat.
 Sicut 3 uor timetunur
 debitoribus.
 Ðra 3ra pe poplaða.
 Leahþay on eon-
 þan.
 Ðam þe 7ið u7 opt
 agyltað.
 And him 7om bæðe.
 7itan neþenceð.
 Fon eapnunge. Ecan
 liþe.
 Et ne no7 inducar in
 temptationem.
 Ne læð þu u7 to
 pite.
 In þean 7onge.
 Ne in cortunge.
 E7i7 neþigenbe.
 Ðy læ7 pe apleare.
 Ealpa þinpa milora.

All our Guilt and
 Sin,
 And our faults for-
 give.
 Bind up our bodily
 Wounds,
 And our Wrongs re-
 mit.
 As oft as we provoke
 The merciful Good-
 ness.
 Of Almighty God.
*Sicut & uor dimittimus
 debitoribus.*
 Even as we forgive,
 Their offence on
 Earth,
 Who are frequently
 Guilty towards us,
 And for their Evil-
 deeds.
 Meditate no Wrath,
 That we may obtain
 eternal Life.
*Et ne nos inducat in
 temptationem.*
 And lead us not to
 Punishment,
 Not into sad despair,
 Nor Temptation,
 Christ our Saviour,
 Left we ungodly
 Men,
 From all thy Mer-
 cies,

APPENDIX

Ðu þi þe on ðe
 Fæmðe þe on ðan
 Seð libera nos a malo.
 And þið yfele ge-
 fæc oðr.

Eac nuða. Feonða
 gehpylcer.

Þe in þe phð locan.

Deoden engla.

Ðanc 7 pulðon.

Ðo þige ðrihten.

Seegað georne.

Ðar ðe þu ur milde.

Mihtum alyrðert.

Fþam hærtnyðe helle

piter.

Amen. Þe on ðe þæt.

Vuet anima mea 7

laudabit te. 7 iudicia

tua adiuuabunt me.

Leopah rapul min.

And þe lurtum he-

peð.

And me þine ðomar.

Ðæum pultumiað.

Eppau sicut ouis que

perueniat nequie

repuum tuum ðomi-

ne. quia mandata

tua non sum oblitus.

It

I alas

Thro' wicked Enmity,

Should be shut out.

Sed libera nos a malo.

From Evil set us free,

Even now from eve-

ry Foe.

We from the bottom

of our Hearts,

Ruler of Angels,

Lord truly vanquish-

ing,

Give Thanks and

Glory,

Forasmuch as thou

By thy Gracious

Power

From Hell's Capti-

vity

Hast us redeemed.

Amen. Be it so.

† Vuet anima mea &

laudabit te, & iudicia

tua adiuuabunt me.

Let my Soul live,

Thee fervently I'll

praise,

And thy Judgments

shall

All my deeds uphold.

|| Erravi sicut ovis que pe-

rierat, require fercum:

tuum domine, quia

mandata tua non sum

oblitus.

I alas

† Psalm. cxix. 175.

|| v. 176.

I alas

I alas

I alas

I alas

I alas

I alas

I alas

I alas

I alas

I alas

I alas

I alas

I alas

I alas

I alas

I alas

I alas

I alas

I alas

APPENDIX

Ic geþelege þa.
 Ðar byrige 7 ceap.
 Ðar ðe forþan
 polse.
 Ðu þa 7 ec þinne
 ege.
 Elne oþhten.

Forðon ic ðinra be-
 boba.

Ne forgear beoph-
 tra æfre.

CREDO IN DEUM

PATREM omni-
 tentem.

Elmihtig fæder.

Up on noðone.

De ða 7 cpan geſce-
 afe.

Eceope 7 pohtet.

And eorðan pang.

Ealne Geſetter.

Ic þe ecne god.

ſenne gecenne.

Lufum gelyfe.

Ðu eart liſeſ fæa.

Engla oþþnuma.

Eorðan fealden.

And ðu gaſſeget.

Gynbar geþohtet.

And

I alas have ſtray'd,
 As that fooliſh Sheep
 That would be un-
 done.

Seek then at leaſt
 thine own

Servant Mighty
 Lord,

For as much as I
 Thy Precepts pure,
 Never will forget.

CREDO IN DEUM

PATREM Omni-
 tentem.

Almighty Father,

In Heaven up on

High.

That the Sky's pure

frame,

In thy Creation

wroughtſt.

And the Earth's vaſt

plain

All didſt firmly ſet.

In thee Eternal God,

In Nature One,

I earneſtly believe.

Thou art Lord of

Life,

Beginning of Angels,

Ruler of the Earth,

And of the Seas vaſt

Ocean

Thou didſt the bot-

tom lay.

And

And

APPENDIX

And so I mane go
cant. *Maepa tungle.*
Et in iesum Chpistum
filiū eius unicum
dominum nostrum.
Ic on sum pme.

Soðne gelyfe.
balenone cyning.
Iðen arendne.
Of þam uplican en-
gla rice.
Done gabriel gøber
apenþaca.
Sanctam Marian.
Sylfne gebotobe.

Ioes unmane.
Deo þæt apense.
Onfeng ppeolice.

And so I pæden
sylfne.
Unþen ihncort co-
pan.
Beapn acenbe.
Nær soþ geynem-
med.
Fipen æt girtum.
Ac þæt haly gart.
Dano girt realsoe.
Dæp fennan boym.
Fylde mid blisse.

And Stars many and
large
Thou didst create.
Et in Iesum Christum
filium eius unicum
Dominum nostrum.
And in thine only
Son
Jesus our true King
I do believe.
Who was hither sent,
From the Angelick
Kingdom above.
Gabriel, God's Mes-
senger,
To holy Mary her
self
Did this reveal.
The Virgin pure
The Annunciation
Gladly received,

And the Father him-
self.
She within her
Womb
Conceiv'd a Son,
No carnal Marriage
Was consummate
there.
But the Holy Ghost,
Did impart his Pow-
er,
And the Virgin's bo-
som
With Joy full fill'd.

And

And

So

A P P E N D I X

And heo cuflice cenbe. Spa mænne. Eopð buenbum engla iocyp- penb. So to pproffe ge- peapð. Fols buenbum, And ymbe bech- leem. Bobeban englar. Dat acennes par. Eprc on eopðan. Passus sub pontio pi- lato. Da se pontifca pila- tur. Feols unben nom pa- num. Ricef 7 soma. Da se deopa ppea beað ppopade. On gealgan reah. Gumena byrhten. Done geomop mod. Lorep byprge. And he of helle. huðe gefette. Of þam furl hope. Sapla manega. So	So that she surely did bring forth To those that dwell on Earth, The great Creator of Angels. Who was to be a fu- ture comfort To the Inhabitants of the Earth. And near <i>Bethleem</i>, Angels proclaimed That Christ on Earth was born. <i>Passus sub Pontio Pilato.</i> When <i>Pontius Pilate</i> Under the Roman Powers, Rul'd as King and Judge, Then our dearest Lord Suffer'd Death Upon the Cross, The Lord of Men, Whom with mourn- ful thought <i>Joseph</i> Buried. And he out of Hell's Captivity brought, From the Brimstone Cave, Many Souls. Then
---	--

APPENDIX.

Der ða uplicne eþel-
recan.

Tertia die resurrexit a
mortuis.

Der þý ðriððan
dæge.

Deoda wealsens.

Aþar ricef fpea.

Recen of molaan.

And he xl daga.

Folgeþar rine.

Rinum aþpette.

And ða his rice be-
gan.

Done uplican eðel
recan.

Epað þæt he nolde.

Nænne forletan.

De him forð openð.

Filan polde.

And mis færtum re-
fan.

Fpebbe geletan.

Epebo in spiritum
sanctum.

I the

Then commanded
them to seek

Their Heavenly
Country.

*Tertia die resurrexit a
mortuis.*

On the third day af-
ter,

The Ruler of Nati-
ons

And Lord of King-
doms arose,

Forthwith from the
dust.

And he xl days

To his Disciples,

Unfolded Myste-
ries.

And then his Reign
began.

To seek his heavenly
Country.

He then this Procla-
mation made,

That he would none
refuse,

Who for the time to
come

Would follow him,

And with sound

Faith

Their Salvation com-
pleat,

Credo in Spiritum San-

ctum.

Etum.

Ic

APPENDIX.

Ic haligne gart.
 Dihte belucc.
 Emne ꝥꝥa ecne ꝥꝥa is.

Aðon gecƿeten.
 Fæder oððe ꝥꝥeo
 bearn.

Folca geneopbum.

Nesýnð ꝥ ꝥꝥeo go-
 tar.

Ðnꝥa genemneb.

Ac is an god.

Seðe ealle hƿarað.

Ða ꝥꝥý naman.

Ðinga genýnum roð
 i rigerart.

Open siðe gerceart.

Feneda pulðonꝥýfa.

Planc i ece.

Sanctam ecclesiam ca-
 tholicam.

Eac ic gelyfe.

Ðæt rýnleoƿe goðe.

De

I the Holy Ghost
 With my sure trust
 embrace;

Who by the Lan-
 guages of the Nations,
 Is made manifest,
 To be equally Eter-
 nal

With the Father,
 And his only Son:
 These are not three
 Gods,

Under † three several
 names.

But it is one God.

All the three Names
 hath

A mysterious thing,
 True, and most con-
 vincing.

O'er the Creation
 wide

He is the Lord of
 Hosts,

And Giver of Glory.
 Magnificent and E-

ternal.
 Sanctam Ecclesiam Ca-
 tholicam.

I likewise believe,
 That † Spouse belo-
 ved of God;

The

† Epiphanius several times calls the Holy Ghost *τὸ τρίτον τῆς ὑπαστάσεως* the third in Name, as the incomparable Ep. Pear-
 son observes.

* *Syn Conjux, Sponsa, a Wife, a Spouse, Ephes. v. 22, 23, 31, 32, & Rev. xix. 7, 9.*

APPENDIX.

De þuþh þenne ge-
þanc.

Ealþop hepað.

Deoþona heah cý-
ning.

Deþ þop life.

Sanctopum communi-
onem.

And ic gemenýcipe.

Maþne getneope.

Ðinpa haligpa.

Deþ þop life.

Remiſſionem peccato-
pum.

Liſſe ic gelyfe.

Leahtpa gehpýlceþ.

Eapny þerupþectio-
nem.

And ic þone apþit

ealpa getneope.

Flæþceþ on folþan.

On þa þophtan.

Et uitam eternam.

Ðan ðu ece lif.

Eallum ðalþeþe.

Spa heþ manna geh-
pýlce.

Metobe gecþemað.

Et ego ad te domine

clamaui ⁊ mane opa-

tio mea pþeueniet te.

Ic me to ðe.

Ece

The Holy Church.

That with one Mind,

Doth Praise the Lord.

Heavens exalted

King.

Here in this Life.

Sanctorum Communio-
nem.

I also believe

The great Commu-

nion

Of all thy Saints

Here in this Life.

Remiſſionem Peccatorum.

And I do believe

The Remiſſion

Of each Offence.

Carnis Reſurrectionem.

And I do believe

The Reſurrection

Of all Fleſh on Earth

At the Day of Dread.

Et uitam Eternam.

When Eternal Life

Thou doſt give to

all

As each Man ſhall

here

His Creator pleaſe.

† Et ego ad te domine

clamavi ⁊ mane Ora-

tio mea pþeueniet te.

I my ſelf to thee

Eternal

APPENDIX.

Ece 6pnhcen.
 And mingebeo mop-
 gena gehpylc.
 Pope rylrne 6e.
 Soðfara bectme.
 Verba mea auribus
 percipe domine in-
 tellege clamorem
 meum.
 Fopð þu min onroh.
 Fuloper ealðon.
 And mið earum ge-
 hyp.
 Ece 6pnhcen.
 Intende uoci orationis
 mea. rex meus. 7 de-
 us meus.
 Ongyt mine cly-
 punga.
 Eudum gepeopðe.
 Beheald min gebes.
 Þolsum mote.
 Du eapt min cýning.
 And eac ece 600.
 Quoniam ad te orabo
 domine. mane exau-
 dies uocem meam.
 Fopðon ic toðe.

Ece

Eternal Lord,
 With full trust of
 Mind,
 Have loudly call'd
 And my faithful
 Prayer
 Every Morning shall
 Before thee come.
 * Verba mea auribus
 percipe domine, intel-
 lige clamorem meum.
 Receive thou my
 words,
 O King of Glory,
 And hear them with
 thy Ears
 Eternal Lord.
 || Intende uoci orationis
 mea, rex meus, & De-
 us meus.
 Hearken to my cry
 In words well known.
 Behold my Suppli-
 cation
 From a faithful mind,
 For thou art my
 King,
 And Eternal God.
 † Quoniam ad te orabo
 domine mane exaudies
 uocem meam.
 Because that I, to
 thee,

Eternal

APPENDIX.

Ece drihten.
Soðum gebedde.
And ðu symble ge-
hȳp.

Morgena gehwylce.
Mine stefne.
Quoniam non deus vo-
lens iniquitatem tu
es. Mane adstabo
tibi ⁊ uidebo.
Ic þe æt stanðe.

Æn on morgen.
And ðe sylfne ge-
reo.
Forðon ic to soþe
pat.
Ðat ðu unriht ne
pilt.

Ænig drihten.
Edoce me was tuar do-
mine notas fac mihi.
⁊ remitas.
Dome þegar þine.

ƿise drihten.
And me ðinra ri-
ga.
ðapa eac gelær.
Dirige me in uerita-
te tua ⁊ doce me
quia tu es deus sa-
lutaris

Eternal Lord.
Faithfully pray.
Do thou always hear

My Voice every
Morn.

* Quoniam non Deus
volens iniquitatem tu
es. Mane adstabo ti-
bi ⁊ uidebo.
I will stand before
thee

Early in the Morn-
ing,
And will look up to
thee,
For as much as I
Certainly know
That thou O Lord

Wilt no unrighteous-
ness.

|| Edoce me, vias tuas do-
mine notas fac mihi,
⁊ semitas tuas.

The ways of thy
Judgments,
And footsteps of thy
Paths,

Teach me oh wise
Lord.

† Dirige me in ueritate
tua ⁊ doce me quia
tu es deus salutaris
meus

* Psal. v. v. 4.

|| Psal. xxv. v. 3.

† v. 4.

APPENDIX.

lutarij meus. ⁊ te
sustinui tota die.
Erepece me on pæbe.

And me picene ge-
læp.

Ðat ic on þinne roð
færcnytte.

Symble lyppe.

Reminiscere miserationum
tuarum domine. ⁊ misericordie
tue que a seculo
sunt.

Ƴer ðu gemýndig.

Miltja þinna.

De ðu drihten ðý-
ðeæt.

Ðýððan ðagar pæ-
non.

And ðu þyllice.

Ðar populo gæret-
teæt.

Delicta iuventutis
meæ ⁊ ignorantias
meas ne memineras
domine. secundum
magnam misericordi-
am tuam memor
esto mei deus.

Ne geminega þu me.

Miltja þýpna.

Epampa

meus, ⁊ te sustinui
tota die.

Direct me with thy
Counsel,

And teach me spee-
dily,

That I may in thy
Truth

For ever live.

† Reminiscere miserationum
tuarum domine
⁊ misericordia tue
que a seculo sunt.

Oh be thou mindful
Of all thy Mercies,
Which thou O Lord
hast done

Since the days have
been.

And thou wisely
hast,

The World esta-
blished.

|| Delicta iuventutis meæ
⁊ ignorantias meas
ne memineras domine,
secundum magnam
misericordiam tuam
memor esto mei Deus.

O be not thou too
mindful

Of my impetuous
Lusts,

D'd Which

APPENDIX

Eþampa togeorne.
þe ic geong dyde.

And me uncūðe. æg-
hþær. þær on.

Fop ðinne þære my-
clan.

Milo heortnyſſe.

Ƴeopð gemýnðg.

Mihtig drihten.

Iudica domine nocen-
ter me. expugna im-
pugnantes me.

Dem drihten nu.

Ða me beþeðon ær.

Aræohht ſpylce.

Ða me fuhtanto.

Adprehende arma ꝥ
ſcutum. ꝥ exurge
in adiutorium mi-
hi.

Legniþ gar ꝥ ſcýlð.

And megeorne ger-
tand.

On fultume.

Ƴið feonda gnyne.

Effunde frameam, ꝥ
conclude aduerſur
eor, qui me peſſe-
cuntur. dic anime
meæ ſalut tua ego
ſum.

Dealo

Which I was guilty
of when young,

And did in igno-
rance.

In the multitude

Of thy Mercies,

Think upon me

Mighty Lord.

* *Judica Domine nocen-
tes me, expugna im-
pugnantes me.*

Judge now O Lord
Them that me have
hurt.

And fight againſt e-
very one

That have againſt
me fought.

† *Adprehende arma &
ſcutum & adurge in
adiutorium mihi.*

Lay hold of thy
Arms and Shield,

And ſtand firmly to
my aid

Againſt the Terrour
of my Foes.

|| *Effunde frameam &
conclude aduerſus eos
qui me peſſecuntur,
dic anime meæ ſalus
tua ego ſum.*

Defend

* *Psalm. xxxv. v. 1.*

† *v. 2.*

|| *v. 3.*

APPENDIX.

Dealo me hepe pæp-
num.

ƿið un holdum.

And ƿiçe beluc.

ƿpaðum ƿeonðum.

De min ehtenð.

Calle ƿynðon.

Sæge þonne ƿyððan.

Saple minne.

Dæt ðu hipe on hæle.

Dolo geƿeode.

Repleatur os meum
laude tua ut possim
cantare gloriam tu-
am tota die magni-
ficentiam tuam.

ðy min muð.

And min mod.

Magne gefylles.

Dæt ic þin lof mæge.

Lurcum ƿingan.

And ƿulðon ðin.

ƿiðe mærcian.

And ðe ealne dæg.

ƿegƿen heƿian.

Averte faciem tuam
a peccatis meis. ⁊
omnes iniquitates
meas dele.

Lpenð

Defend me with thy
Weapons,

Against the Unfaith-
ful,

And protect me in
the Battel.

Against my furious
Enemies,

That are all persecu-
ting me.

Say then hencefor-
ward to my Soul,

Thou to her safety
kindly stood.

† Repleatur os meum
laude tua ut possim
cantare gloriam tuam
tota die magnificenti-
am tuam.

Let my Mouth and
Mind

With thy power be
fill'd

That I may thy
praise

Sing with delight.

And thy Glory

Magnifie abroad,

And thee all the day

Each where cele-
brate.

|| Averte faciam tuam
a peccatis meis, ⁊
omnes iniquitates me-
as dele.

Dd 2

Turn

A P P E N D I X.

Apenð þine angyne.
 A fram minum.
 Fræcnum fýpenum.
 And nu forð heo-
 non.

Call min unriht.

Adpær æghwær fýmle.

Lof munðum cfeā in
 me deus. ⁊ spiritum
 pectum innoua in
 uisceribus meis.
 Gyle me halig god.
 Deortan clæne.
 And rihtne gars.
 God genipa on.
 Ompe gehigðe.
 Dupa mi drihten.

Ne ppouciar me a facie
 tua. ⁊ spiritum san-
 ctum tuum ne au-
 ferar a me.

Ne aripp þu me.

Fulðper ealðop.

Fram ðimpe angyne.

ƿerne to peope.

Ne hupu on peg a-
 bep.

Done halgan gars.

Ɗæt he me færinga.

Fremðe pypðe.

Redde michi lætitiā
 ralutarij

Turn away thy face
 From my destructive
 Sins,

And now from hence
 forth

All mine unrighte-
 ousness

Every where blot
 out.

† *Cor mundum crea in
 me deus, & Spiritum
 rectum innoua in vis-
 ceribus meis.*

Give me holy God

A clean Heart

And a right Spirit,

In my Soul, O God,

Renew at least, my

Lord.

|| *Ne proicias me a facie
 tua & Spiritum san-
 ctum tuum ne auferas
 a me.*

Cast me not away,

O Lord of Glory,

From before thy
 face

Ever too far,

At least bear not
 away

Thy holy Spirit.

That he forthwith
 become

A stranger to me.

* *Redde michi letitiā
 salutaris*

APPENDIX.

salutaris tui ⁊ spī-
ritu principali con-
firma me.

Syle me þinne hælu.

Dolce blisse.

And me ealþon lice.

Ʒeþe garte.

On ðinne willan ge-
tþyme.

Ʒeþoða bþihten.

Eþipe me domine ab
homine malo a uirō
iniquo libera me.

Geneþe ne þið niðe.

On naman þinum.

Fþam Ʒpelum men.

Ece bþihten.

Eþipe me de inimicis
meis deus meus ⁊ ab
insurgentibus in me
libera me.

Aþneþe me halig

god,
Deþigeþ niðeþ.

Feonba minna.

De me þeohtað to.

Alyþ me fþam la-
ðum.

De me luge on.

Riþan pillað nymþe.

salutaris tui ⁊ spī-
ritu principali confirma
me.

Give me thy Salva-
tion

With sure happiness,
And with thy prin-
cipal, noble Spirit

Render me perfect

In all thy Will,

O Lord of Hosts.

† Eripe me domine ab
homine malo a viro
iniquo libera me.

Deliver me from the
Envy

Of evil Men

For thy name's sake
Eternal Lord.

|| Eripe me de inimicis
meis deus meus ⁊ ab
insurgentibus in me li-
bera me.

Rid me, O holy God,

From the heavy Ma-
lice

Of my Foes

That against me
fight.

Release me from the
wicked,

That would devour
me with Lyes,

Du

D d 3

Unless

APPENDIX.

Da me þæt gife.

Eripe me ðe operanti-
bus iniquitatem. ⁊
ðe uino sanguinum
salua me.

Genep me fram
niðe.

Nahz frammenþa.

Ðe heþ unrihter
ealle pýnceað.

And me wið bloð
hneoper reþer.

Bealuþe gehæle.

Sic pralimum dicam no-
mini tuo ðeþ in se-
culum reculi ut red-
dam uota mea ðe ðie
in diem.

þa ic naman þinum.

Neoðe ringe.

Ðat min gehat heþ
agylbe.

Of ðæg on ðæg.

þa hit geðeþe reþe.

Exaudi noþ ðeþ salu-
tariþ noþteþ. ⁊ þer
omnium finium tep-
ne ⁊ in mari longe.

Lehyþ uþ hælenð
god.

Ðu eapz hiht ealpa.

Unless thy Grace
prevent.

* Eripe me de operanti-
bus iniquitatem, ⁊
de viro sanguinum
salua me.

Deliver me from the
Malice

Of those that do no
good.

That here work all
unrighteousness.

And from blood-guil-
ty Men's

Confusion save.

† Sic Psalmum dicam
nomini tuo Deus in
seculum seculi, ut red-
dam uota mea de die
in diem.

So I thy name

Will dutifully sing,

And perform my

Vow,

From day to day,

As becometh me.

|| Exaudi nos, Deus sa-
lutaris noster spes om-
nium finium Terra
⁊ in Mari longe.

Hear us God, our Sa-
viour,

Thou that art the
Hope

De

Of

* Psal. lvi. v. 2.

† Psal. lxi. v. 8.

||* Psal. lxxv. v. 5.

APPENDIX.

De on ðirre eopðan.
Utan rýnbon.

Oððe peop on ƿa
ƿoldum ƿuniað.

Benedic anima mea do-
mino. ⁊ omnia in-
teruora mea nomen
sanctum eius.

Bletra mine ƿaþle.
Bliðe spihthen.

And eall min in ne-
þan.

Ðiſ þone ecan na-
man.

Benedic anima mea do-
mino. ⁊ noli obliu-
ſci omnes petributi-
ones eius.

Bletrige mine ƿaþle.
Bealde spihthen.

Ne ƿilt ðu oƿer
geotul.

ƿeƿe peopðan.
Ealƿu goða.

De he ðe aþþyðe.

Qui ƿropitiatur om-
nibus iniquitatibus
tuis. qui sanat om-
nes languores tuos.

De þinu in man-ðe-
dum.

Miltreðe eallum.

Of all that be
Upon the surface of
the Earth,
And that remain
Far in the bottom of
the Sea.

* *Benedic anima mea &
Domino omnia interi-
ora mea nomen san-
ctum eius.*

Bless, O my Soul,
Cheerfully the Lord,
And all that is in
me

His Eternal name.

† *Benedic anima mea
Domino & noli obli-
visci omnes retribu-
tiones eius.*

Bless, O my Soul,
Faithfully the Lord,
Nor be thou ever
forgetful

Of all the good
things

He e'en did for thee.

|| *Qui propitiatur omni-
bus iniquitatibus tu-
is, qui sanat omnes
languores tuos.*

He thy wicked deeds

Hath all forgiven.

And

D d 4

And

APPENDIX.

Ans ðine aþle.

Ealle gehælb.

Qui pædemit de inte-
ritu uitam tuam.
qui sanat in bonis
desiderium tuum.
Se alyrðe þin lyp.

Leof of forþþyðe.

Fylðe þinne willan.

Fæge me gobe.

Qui componat te in mi-
seratione ⁊ misere-
cordia renouabitur
sicut aquile iuuen-
tur tua.
De ðe gerygeraþe.
Soðne mið þe.

Ans ðe mið heorte.

Mode getrymeðe.

Eaþt ðu eompe.

Eaþne gelicort.

On geoguðe nu.

Uleap gepoþen.

Confiteor domino deo
cæli.

And all thy weak-
nesses

Hath also heal'd.

† Qui redemit de inte-
ritu vitam tuam, qui
sanat in bonis deside-
rium tuum.

Who thy life hath
sav'd

Kindly from destru-
ction.

And fulfill'd thy
Will

In season with all
good.

|| Qui coronat te in mi-
seratione ⁊ misere-
cordia, renouabitur si-
cut aquile iuuentus
tua.

He crowneth thee
With true compassi-
on,

And with loving
kindness

Doth thee adorn.

Thou shalt be resto-
red

Just as is an Eagle,

Now in Youth,

And shalt wise become.

Confiteor Domino Deo
Cæli.

I make my Confes-
sion to the Lord of
Heaven.

Con-

Con-

APPENDIX.

Conuerpte nos deus sa-
lutaris noster. ⁊
auerte iram tuam
a nobis.
Gehþeopp us hpa ðe.
Dælenð ðrihten.

⁊ ðin ýppe fram us.

Eac on cýppe.
Dignape domine die
isto. sine peccata
nos custodire.
Milsra us nupa.

Mihtig ðrihten.

Milsra us.

Fiat misericordia tua
domine super nos
quemadmodum spe-
rauimus in te.

Fere þin milsþeop-
tun.

Mihtig ðrihten.

Þell oþer us.

Sya þe penaþ on þe.

Domine saluum fac pe-
gem. ⁊ exaudi nos in
die qua inuocaueri-
mur te.

Do ðrihten god
cýng.

Dædum halne.

Anð

* Conuertere nos Deus sa-
lutaris noster, ⁊
auerte iram tuam a
nobis.

Turn us speedily,
O Lord, our Savi-
our,

And thy Indigna-
tion

Turn away from us.
Dignare Domine die
isto, sine peccato nos
custodire.

Have Mercy now on
us,

Mighty Lord,

Have Mercy on us.

* Fiat misericordia tua
Domine super nos
quemadmodum spera-
uimus in te,

Let thy loving kind-
ness,

Mighty Lord,

Be still over us

As we trust in thee.

|| Domine saluum fac
regem ⁊ exaudi nos
in die qua inuocave-
rimus te

O Lord God preserve
The King in all his
actions,

And

* Psal. lxxxv. v. 4.

|| Psal. xx. v. 10.

† Psal. xxxiii. v. 21.

APPENDIX.

And us eac gehyr.
Dolbum mode.

Spilce peðe barga.
Drihten cigen.
Saluum fac populum
tuum Domine. ⁊
benedic hereditati
tue. ⁊ rege eor ⁊
extolle illos urque in
æternum.
Dalso þu polc.

Dalig drihten.
And ðin ypre eac.

Gal gebletja.
Rece þu heo rpylce.
And on wight ahefe.

Dæt hi on populse.
Dæt hi on populse.

Synnun lifigen.
Fiat pax in uirtute
tua. ⁊ abundantia in
turribus tuis.

ðyðe on ðinum
magne rib.

Mæst ⁊ rymmer.
And on þinum top-
pum.

Yere tibun geniht-
rum.

Domine exaudi ora-
tionem

And hear us likewise,
With thy gracious
favour,

Each day that we call
On thee, O Lord,

|| *Saluum fac populum
tuum Domine, ⁊ be-
nedic hereditati tue,
⁊ rege illos ⁊ extol-
le illos usque in æter-
num.*

Save thine own Peo-
ple,

Holy Lord,
And all thine Inhe-
ritance,

Bless thou likewise.
Govern all of them,
And lift them up in
righteousness,

That they in the
World,

May peaceably live

* *Fiat Pax in uirtute
tua ⁊ abundantia in
turribus tuis.*

Be Peace thro' thy
might

Most and first of all
And within thy
Towers

Be plenteous times.

† *Domine exaudi Ora-
tionem*

|| *Psal. xxviii. v. 12.*

† *Psal. cii. v. 1.*

* *Psal. cxii. v. 7.*

APPENDIX

onem meam ⁊ clamor meus ad te perueniat.

Du min gebed.

Maene drihten.

Gehyr heofonar weard.

And gehlybe min.

To ðe becume.

Deoda peccend.

Miserere mei deus secundum magnam misericordiam tuam.

Milora me.

Mihzig drihten.

Sya ðu manegum syðert.

Seften ðinne þære mycelan milheortnyrre.

Domine Deus uirtutum conuertere nos ⁊ ostende faciem tuam ⁊ salui erimus.

Gehweorð us magna god.

And us milbe æteop.

Ðinne andplitan.

Ealle we beoð hale.

Domine sancte Patern

tionem meam ⁊ clamor meus ad te perueniat.

My Prayer, mighty Lord,

Towards Heaven hear.

And let my cry to thee.

Ruler of Nations, come.

* Miserere mei Deus secundum magnam misericordiam tuam.

Have Mercy on me, mighty Lord,

As thou to many hast done,

After my manifold loving kindness.

|| Domine Deus uirtutum conuertere nos, ⁊ ostende faciem tuam ⁊ salui erimus.

Turn thou us Lord of Hosts,

And favourably shew

To us thy countenance,

And we shall all be whole.

O Lord, holy Father, Almighty

* Psalm. li. 1.

|| Psal. lxxx. v. 20.

APPENDIX

ten omnipotens aton-
ne deus. qui nos ab
principium huius diei
peruenire fecisti. tua
nos salua uirtute. ut
in hac die ad nullum
declinemus peccatum.
sed semper ab tua
iustitiam facientiam
nostra pprocebant elo-
quia. ⁊ dirigantur ope-
ra.

Preciosa est in con-
spectu domini. mors
sanctorum eius.

Sancta dei genetrix
uirgo Maria ⁊ omnes
sancti dei intercebant
pro nobis peccatori-
bus. ad dominum do-
minorum ut merea-
mur ab eo adiuuari
⁊ saluari qui uiuit ⁊
regnat deus.

Deus in adiutorium
meum intende domine
ab

Almighty and Everlast-
ing God, who hast
brought us to the begin-
ning of this day, keep us
by thy Power, that this
day we may fall into
no Sin, but that all our
words and works may
be utter'd, and dire-
cted to fulfil thy Righ-
teousness.

† *Right dear in the
sight of the Lord is the
death of his Saints.*

|| Let the holy Mo-
ther of God, the Vir-
gin Mary, and all the
Saints of God inter-
cede for us Sinners,
with the Lord of Lords,
that we may be worthy
to be assisted and sa-
ved by him, who li-
vest and reignest God.
*Deus in adiutorium me-
um intende, Domine*
ad

† *Plalm. cxvi. v. 13.*

|| In another ancient MS. said to be written in Latin by
Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, and translated into Saxon
by Ælfrick. After the names of those Saints were repeated,
whose Feasts were to follow the next Morning, and the verse
Right dear, &c. The Prior was to pray in this manner, *Ipsi ⁊*
omnes sancti intercedant pro nobis peccatoribus, ad Dominum,
ut mereamur possidere vitam aeternam. Amen. May these and
all the Saints intercede with our Lord for us Sinners, that we
may be worthy to obtain Eternal Life. *Amen.*

APPENDIX.

ad adiuvandum me pe-
nitentia.

ƿes drihten god.

Deo ƿe fultum.

Beheald me driht-
ten.

And me hƿa ðe ryð-
ðan gefultuma.

ƿet ƿeoph þearfe.

Gloria Patris.

Kyrrlic eleison.

Pater noster.

Et ne nos inducar.

Respice in seruos tuos

ƿ in opera tua do-

mine ƿ ðerige ƿilios

eorum.

Geƿeoh þine ƿceal-

car.

Sparum eagam.

And on þin agen

ƿeopc.

Ece drihten.

And heopa bearn

geƿece.

Bliðum mobe.

Et sit splendor domi-

ni dei nostri super

nos ƿ in opera manu-

um nostrarum di-

rige ƿeƿeƿi nos.

ƿeƿe us beophhtnyr.

Oƿen

ad adiuvandum me festi-
na.

Look on me, O Lord

God,

With thy precious

aid.

O Lord help me.

O be a ready help

To me in time to

come

At my Life's need.

Glory be to.

Lord have Mercy.

Our Father.

And lead us not.

† Respice in seruos tuos

Domine & in opera

tua & dirige Filios

eorum.

Look upon thy Ser-

vants,

With favourable

Eyes.

And on thine own

Works,

Eternal Lord.

And their Sons di-

rect,

With thy sweet Grace.

|| Et sit splendor Domini

Dei nostri super nos,

& opera manuum no-

strarum dirige super

nos.

Let the favourable,

Brightness

APPENDIX

Open bliðan bryht-
nes.

Uper þæt goðan go-
des.

Georne. open ealle.

Geþece ure hanð ge-
þeopc.

Deah open ure.

Glōria Patri.

Opemur. dirigere ⁊
sanctificare ac rege-
re digneris domine de-
us pater creator celi ⁊
terre homine quesumus
cotidie corpora ⁊ corpora
nostra actus quoque
⁊ sermones nostros in
lege tua ⁊ in precep-
tis mandatorum tuo-
rum ut hic ⁊ ubique.
per te semper salui ⁊
liberi eris. inepen-
mur saluator mundi
qui cum patre ⁊ spi-
ritu sancto uiuis ⁊
regnas deus. per om-
nia secula seculorum.
Amen. Adiuutorium
nostrum in nomine do-
mini. qui fecit cælum
⁊ terram. Benedicite.
Deus dei filius noster be-
nedicere dignetur.
Amen.

Brightness of the
Lord,

Of our good God,

Still be upon us,

And guide our han-
dywork,

O thou most High.

We beseech thee that
thou wouldst be plea-
sed to direct, sanctifie,
and govern, O Lord
God and King, Creator
of Heaven and Earth,
to Day, and every
Day, both our Hearts
and Bodies, our Actions
also and Speeches in
thy Law, and in the
Precepts of thy Com-
mandments, that we
may both here, and
every where, thorough
thee be in safety, and
freedom, O Saviour of
the World, who with the
Father and the Holy
Spirit, livest and reign-
est God throughout all
Ages. *Amen.* Our help
is in the Lord our God,
who hath made Hea-
ven and Earth. Bless
the Lord. The Lord,
the Son of God, vouch-
safe to bless us. *Amen.*

De

De

APPENDIX

De Officio tertiæ
hore.

On unþern þe reu-
lon god heþian. for-
ðam on unþern ti-
man criſt þaſ ðuph
þana iudea þom to
deaðe forðemes. 7 to-
weaþ þaþe noþe ge-
laþ. þe he ryððan on
þrowe. 7 eft æfter
hiſ æriſte. on pente-
cortener ðag com re
halga gart on unþern
tuman oþen ða apor-
tolas. þaþ hi æt ga-
þene geſamnoþe þa-
non. 7 hi ealle ſona
geſýlleþe purdon ſpa-
riþe mid goder gyfe.
þaþ hi ealpa geþeowða
getingneſſe hæþon.
7 heopa laþ weaþð ge-
onð ealne midðancapð
ryððan gecyðeð 7 ge-
ðaleð þeodum to helpe.
Unþern iſ ðager
ðriþþe tið. þonne iſ
eac rihtlic þaþ þe to
þaþe þriþþan tiðe þa
halgan ðriþneſſe ge-
ornlice heþian.

Of the Office of the
third Hour.

At Undern we ought
to praise God, because
about that time Christ
was condemned to
Death by the Jewish
Sanhedrim, and was
led toward the Cross,
upon which afterward
he suffered. And a-
gain, after his Resur-
rection, the Holy Ghost
came upon the Apo-
stles as they were as-
sembled together upon
the day of pentecost a-
bout nine in the Morn-
ing. And they were
all on a sudden so pow-
erfully filled with the
Grace of God, as to have
a ready eloquence in all
Languages. And their
Doctrine was after-
wards publish'd and
dispers'd over all the
Earth, for the benefit
of the Nations. Un-
dern is the third Hour
of the Day. And it is
but just that at the
third Hour of the Day
we should diligently
worship the Holy Tri-
nity.

Deus

Lord

APPENDIX

Deur in adiutorium
meum intende.

Gloria Patri.

Hymnus.

Nunc sancte nobis
spiritus.

Salmus. CAPTEL.

Gratia vobis et pax
a deo patre nostro et
domino iesu christo.

Deo gratias.

Adiutor meus.

Kynnie leison.

Erisse leison.

Kynnie leison.

Pater noster.

Ego dixi domine mi-
serere mei. sana a-
nimam meam quia
peccavi tibi.

Ic nu mægene
cpepe.

Miltja me drihten.

Dal mine saþle.

Fonðon me hreo-
peð nu.

Ðat ic sipene on ðe.

Fremebe geneah hige
Converte

Lord come to my
help.

Glory be to the Fa-
ther.

The Hymn.

Nunc sancte nobis spi-
ritus.

Psalms. CAPTEL.
the Lesson.

* Grace be to you,
and Peace from God the
Father, and from our
Lord Jesus Christ.

Thanks be to God.

My Help.

Lord have Mercy.

Christ have Mercy

on us,

Lord have Mercy on

us.

Our Father.

† Dixi Domine miserere
mei, sana animam
meam quia peccavi
tibi.

I now strongly cry,

Have Mercy on me
Lord.

Heal my Soul,

For I now repent,

That with such ea-
gerness,

I have transgress'd.

Converte

* Rom. i. v. 7.

† Psal. xli. v. 4.

APPENDIX

Conuerſe domine a-
liquantulum ⁊ de-
precabilis eris ſu-
per ſeruos tuos.
Gehpeoꝛ uꝛ hꝛæt
hꝛyꝛu.

halig drihten.
ſer ſinum ꝛealcum.

ſel eað bene.

Mitte eiꝛ domine
auxilium.

Domine exaudi.

Dominuꝛ nobiſcum.

Domine deus qui ho-
na teꝛtia diei ab cru-
ciꝛ poenam ꝑꝛo mundi
ſalute ductuꝛ eꝛ. te
ſuppliciteꝛ deprecamur
ut de ꝑꝛeſenti-
tiꝛ malis noꝛtiꝛ ſem-
ꝑꝛ apud te inuenia-
mur ueniam ⁊ de ſu-
turiꝛ iugiteꝛ habea-
mur cuſtodiam. qui
cum patre.

DE OFFICIO SEXTÆ HORE.

On midne dæg we
ſeulon god heꝛian. ꝑꝛo-
ðam to middeꝛ dæges
cꝛiſt ꝑꝛ on roðe aðe-
ned. ⁊ uꝛ ealle þa ȝuþ
hiꝛ ðꝛopunge. mid hiꝛ
deop-

† Conuerſe Domine ali-
quantulum ⁊ depre-
cabilis eſto ſuper ſer-
uos tuos.

Turn to us a little,

Holy Lord,

And for thy Ser-
vants

Be eaſily entreated.

Send them thy help.

O Lord hear us.

The Lord be with us.

O Lord our God, who
at the third our of the
Day waſt led to the
punishment of the Croſs
for the Salvation of the
World. We humbly be-
ſeech thee that we may
both find pardon with
thee for our paſt Sins,
and likewise thy ꝑꝛo-
tection for the time to
come, who with the Fa-
ther.

Of the Office of the ſixth Hour.

At Midday we ought
to worſhip God, be-
cauſe at Mid-day Chriſt
waſ ſtretched out upon
the Croſs. And did
then by his Sufferings
E e and

A P P E N D I X.

ðeoppýðan bloðe ge-
boht. of ðeoðles an-
realdre 7 of ecan ðeaðe.
7 ðy we ſculon on ðone
tíman to criſte beon
georne clypiðende. 7
hine hepiðende þæt we
mið þam geryteliā.
þæt we gemýnðige be-
on. þāne myclan mið-
heontnyrre. þe he on
mancýnne gepophete þa
ða he let hine rýlfe
ryllan to cýale. for
mancýnnes ðearfe.

*Deus in adiutorium
meum intende.*

Gloria Patri.

YMNUS.

*Rector potens ue-
rax.*

CAPITULA.

Omnia autem pro-
bate quod bonum est
tenete. ab omni specie
mala abstinete uos.
Deo gratias. Dominus
regit me. Cyprie lei-
ron. Criſte leiſon.
kýppie

and precious Blood re-
deem all of us from the
power of the Devil, and
of Eternal Death. And
we ought therefore at
that time to be dili-
gently calling upon
Christ, and praising him
that we may thereby
make it manifest that
we are mindful of the
manifold Mercies he
then wrought for Man-
kind, when he permit-
ted himself to be deli-
vered up to Death for
the sake of Man.

Lord by thou my
aid.

Glory be to the Fa-
ther.

The Hymn.

Rector potens verax.

THE LESSON.

|| *Prove all things,
hold fast that which is
good. Abstain from all
appearance of Evil.*
Thanks be to God, the
Lord governs me. Lord
have Mercy on us.
Christ have Mercy up-
on

APPENDIX

Kynne leison.

COLLETA

Domine Iesu Cris-
te qui sexta hora
pro nobis in cruce ar-
cendisti. ⁊ adam de
inferno eripisti. eum-
que in paradiso resti-
tueris. te quaerimus
ut ab omnibus pecca-
tis nostris eripe nos
iubeas ⁊ in operibus
tuis sanctis semper
custodiar. Iesu Cris-
te qui cum.

ON NON TIDAN pe-
rculon god god hepan.
forðam on þone tidan
crist gebæd. forðam
þe him depeðon. ⁊
ryððan his gart a-
rende. ⁊ on ðone ti-
man rculon geleafulle
men hi georne gebið-
ðan. ⁊ gemunan þæt
pundor þ ða geporðen
pearð. þa se rylpa for
mancyn deað gepo-
lobe. þe eallum man-
cynne lifes geuðe.

Dominus in adju-
torium meum.

Gloria Patri.

on us. Lord have Mer-
cy upon us.

The COLLECT.

O Lord Iesu Christ,
who at the sixth Hour
didst ascend upon the
Cross for us, and who
didst bring Adam out
of Hell and restore him
to Paradise, we beseech
thee that thou wouldst
cause us to be deliver-
ed from all our Sins,
and that thou wouldst
keep us ever more in
thy holy Works. O
Lord Iesu Christ, who
with

At Noon we ought
to praise God, because
at that time Christ
prayed for those that
persecuted him. And
afterwards sent his Spi-
rit. And at that time
ought all faithful Men
to pray diligently. And
to be mindful of that
Miracle which was then
wrought, when he him-
self suffered Death for
all Mankind, who gi-
veth life to all Men.

Dominus in adju-
torium meum.

Glory be to the Fa-
ther.

YMNUS.

Ecce

HYMNUS.

APPENDIX.

YODNUS.

Requiem dominus te-
nar uigori.

CAPITULA.

Alten alterius hone-
na pontate. 7 sic ab-
implebitur legem cu-
rit. Deo gratias. ab
ocultis meis munda me
domine. Kyrieiel. Epi-
rtel. Kyrie.

COLLECT.

Domine iesu chris-
te qui hora nona in cru-
cis patibulo confiten-
tem latronem in tra-
maia paradysi tran-
sire iussisti. tibi sup-
pliciter confitenter
peccata nostra depne-
camur delectar. 7 post
obitum nostrum pa-
radisi nobis gaudia in-
troune concedas salua-
ton mundi. qui cum
patre.

Ad uesperum.

On aphen ye sculon
gob

HYMNUS.

Rerum Dominus te-
nar uigor.

CAPITULA.

† Bear ye one an-
ther's Burthens, and so
ye shall fulfil the Law
of Christ. Thanks be
to God. Cleanse me
from my secret faults,
O Lord. Lord have,
Ec.

COLLECT.

O Lord Jesu Christ,
who at the ninth Hour
of the Day didst com-
mand the penitent
Thief upon the Cross
to enter into the Walls
of Paradise. We hum-
bly making our Con-
fession to thee, beseech
thee to blot out our
Offences, and grant
that after our Life end-
ed here, we may enter
into the Joys of Para-
dise, O Saviour of the
World, who with the
Father.

For the Evening Ser-
vice.

At Even we ought to
praise

APPENDIX.

god he man on ðone
tuman man offpode on
þære ealban æ. 7 mi
neceþ neocan on ðam
temple þæt weofod ge
opne weofode gode to
lofe. 7 on æfen tuman
we bryhten offpode.
æt his æfen geþeode
7 wære his discipulum
þurh halig geþyne
hlaf 7 win for his syl
fes lichaman. 7 for
his ægen bloð 7 on
æfen tuman his þær
þæt ioseph criſter. Li
chaman of pode ali
node. þonne we æ
gen myccele þearfe þæt
we sylle gemunan 7
gode þancian. 7 on þone
tuman we geþebu u
rum bryhtne geopne
offpian eal swa danið
craðð. *Dignatur do
mine ad te oratio mea.
sicut incensum in con
spectu tuo.*

So on ðinne geþiððe.

Criner sylfes geþeb.

Full weene geþeht.

Sw a neceþ b.ð.

praise God, this being
the time of Offering
under the old Law :
And they were then
accustom'd diligently
to burn Incense upon
the Altar in the Tem
ple to the praise of God.
And at Evening time
our Lord offered at his
own Table, and deli
vered to his Disciples
thro' holy Mystery,
Bread and Wine, for
his own Body, and for
his own Blood.

And it was at Even
that Joseph took down
Christ's Body from the
Cross. Then ought we
in much Duty to be
mindful of this, and to
thank God : And at
that time earnestly to
offer up our Prayers to
our Lord, as David
saith, *Let my Prayer, O
Lord, be directed to thee,
even as incense in thy
sight.*

Let my supplica
tion

Be in thy sight, O Lord,
Immediately sent
up,

As the Incense is

APPENDIX.

Donne gippe
Gleba bapna.

Dominus in adiuto-
rium meum intende.

Gloria Patri.

Spacia domini no-
stri Iesu Christi et ca-
pituli dei et communi-
tatis spirituum sancti
in semper cum omni-
bus nobis.

Deo gnatur. R. Ad-
iutorium nostrum in
nomine domini.

V Qui fecit celum
et terram.

O lux beata trini-
tatis.

V Dirigatur domine
ad te oratio mea.

Quoniam tu es
sanctum nomen eius
super omnes.

O Magnificat.

Kyrie leison.

Epyte leison.

Kyrie leison.

Pater noster.

And

Which the fierce heat
consumes.

O Lord make haste
to help me.

Glory be to the Fa-
ther.

The Grace of our
Lord Jesus Christ, and
the Love God, and the
Fellowship of the Holy
Ghost be with us all
evermore.

Thanks be to God.

R. Our help is in the
name of the Lord.

V Who hath made
Heaven and Earth.

O Lux Beata trini-
tatis.

V Let my Prayer
come up to thee, O

Lord.

The Mercy of the
Lord, and his Holy
Name is upon them
that fear him.

Magnificat.

Lord have Mercy
upon us.

Christ have Mercy
on us,

Lord have Mercy on
us.

Our Father.

And

APPENDIX

Et ne nos inducar in
temptationem.

Precor ego omni do-
mine.

COLLECTA.

Opemur uespere. 7
mane 7 meridie.

Miserationem tuam
suppliciter exoramus:
ut expulsi se cordibus
nostris peccatorum
tenebris, ad tuam lu-
cem, qua Christus est
nos faciat pervenire.

As COMPLETORIO.

On foran miht pe
rculon god herian. an
pe to bedde gan. 7 ge-
munan þæt crist on byn-
gene neah foran mihte
begyngeð pearf. 7 ðær
his lichaman on ge-
nerre. swa lange swa his
willa wæs. þonne age we
þær micle þearfe. þæt
we þæt geþencan 7 us sylfe
on ðone timan gode
betacan an we to bed-
de gan. 7 hine biððan
þæt he us geðeðne nerre
geunna

And lead us not into
temptation.

Unto thee, O Lord,
have I made my sup-
plication.

THE COLLECT.

At Evening, and
Morning, and Midday,
let us pray.

We humbly beseech
thy Majesty, that ha-
ving expelled out of
our Hearts the dark-
ness of our Sins, thou
wouldst bring us to the
true Light, which is
Christ.

The Completorian.

At the beginning of
the Night we ought to
praise God, before we
go to Bed; And to re-
member that about the
fore-part of the Night
Christ was buried in
his Sepulchre, where
his body rested so long
as it was his pleasure,
Then it is highly our
Duty, to consider that
with our selves, and
at that time to betake
our selves to God, be-
fore we go to Bed. And
to beg of him to give
us convenient rest, and

APPENDIX.

Seinna 7 pið georles
Cortmunga 7 gercylbe
Ira hyrilla ry.

Conuente nos deus.
deus in tabernaculum
meum.

HYMNUS.

Te lucis ante ter-
minum. Christus qui lux es
et dies.

IN NOCTE.

Tu an nobis es do-
mine 7 nomen san-
ctum tuum inuocatum
et digne nos ne depe-
linquar nos domine de-
us nostre. deo gratias.

Eustobi nos domine
ut pupillam oculi.

kyppie leison.

Episte leison.

kyppie leison.

Patep nostre.

Epeso in deum pa-
trem. Benedicamus

patrem. Benedicatur
es domine. Benedicat

7 custodiat nos omni-
potens deus. Amen.

Dignare domine nocte
ista. Opemur uirga

domine

defend us against the
temptations of the De-
vil, according to his
Will.

Turn thou us, O God.
God be my help.

HYMN.

Te lucis ante termi-
num. Christus qui lux es
et dies.

IN THE NIGHT.

Thou art in us, O
Lord, and thy holy
Name is called upon
us. Forsake us not, O
Lord God. Thanks be
to God.

|| *Keep us as the ap-
ple of thy Eye.*

Lord have Mercy
upon us.

Christ have Mercy
upon us.

Lord have Mercy
upon us.

Our Father.

I believe in God the
Father. Let us bless
the Father. Blessed art
thou, O Lord. May the
Almighty Lord bless
and keep us, Amen.
Vouchsafe, O Lord, this
Night. Let us pray.

Visit,

APPENDIX.

domine habitationem
istam ⁊ omnes iniquitates
inimici ab ea longe pe-
pelle. angeli tui nos
in ea pace custodiant.
⁊ benedictio tua sit
super nos semper per
eundem. dominum no-
biscum. Benedicamus
domino. Benedictio dei
patris omnipotentis ⁊
filii. ⁊ spiritus san-
cti. maneat semper
nobiscum. Amen.

Visit, O Lord, this ha-
bitation, and drive a-
way all the Snares of
the Enemy far from it.
Let thy Angels watch
over us in it in peace.
And thy blessing al-
ways be upon us, thro'
the same. The Lord
be with you. Let us
praise the Lord. The
blessing of God Al-
mighty, the Father,
the Son, and the holy
Ghost remain with you
evermore. *Amen.*

DE NOCTURNALI CELEBRATIONE.

ON UBTAN þe scul-
lon god herian, eal swa
ðamð cƿæð. Media noc-
te sungeham ad confes-
sionem tibi super in-
dicia iusticie tue. ðæt
is. to middre niht ic
apas drihten. ⁊ cetena.
criste sylf beað þæt
þe georne pacian sceol-
ðan. he cƿæð. Vigila-
to ergo quia nescitis
quando veniet domi-
nus. ðæt bið. paciað
georne. forðan þe ge
nyton hƿenne copen
drihten

OF THE MIDNIGHT OFFICE.

At Midnight we
ought to praise God, as
David saith, † *Media
nocte, &c.* that is, *At
Midnight I arose, O
Lord, &c.* Christ him-
self commanded that
we should watch dili-
gently; He saith, ‖ *Vi-
gilate, &c.* that is,
*Watch ye diligently, for
ye know not the Hour
when your Lord cometh.*
* *Beati, &c.* Blessed are
*the Men whom the Lord
shall find watching when
he*

† *Psal. cxix. v. 62.*

‖ *Mat. xiv. v. 42.*

* *v. 46.*

APPENDIX.

ðrihten cymð. 7 eft
 he cƿæð. Beati repul
 illi quor cum uenerit.
 dominus. þæt is ea
 biðe beoð þa men þe
 se hlaford pacigende
 gemet. þonne he to
 cymð. Ur is mycil
 ðearf þ þe geornlice
 pacian 7 ƿape beon.
 for þam nele beað na
 cyðan hƿenne he cu
 man ƿile. þe ma þe
 þeoƿ ac he cymð þonne
 man leſt þenð þonne
 bið se ſpyðe geſealið
 ſe ðe bið þonne paci
 genðe. ſe bið pacigen
 ðe ðe armeað ymbe
 godes ƿillan. 7 ymbe
 his agene þearfe. 7
 on ðam ge endap. 7
 ſebið ſleac. 7 ſlæpen
 ðe. ſe ðe full gæð
 eallum his lȝðnum lȝr
 tum. ðuþh ðeoƿles
 lape. 7 on ðam ge en
 ðað. 7 þonne age þe
 mycle þearfe. þæt þe
 geornlice pacian. 7 a
 ƿape beon ƿið ðeoƿles
 coſtnunga. 7 þæt þe ge
 onne to gode clyþian.
 7 to him ge earman
 þæt he us geƿylſte.
 ðuþh

be cometh. We have
 great need to watch di
 ligently and beware,
 forasmuch as death will
 not tell us when he
 will come, || *No more*
than the Thief; but he
 cometh at that time,
 when Men leaſt think
 of it; then is he very
 happy, who is at that
 time waking. Now he
 is watchful, who is ſtu
 dious concerning the
 Will of God, and his
 own Duty, and who
 ends his life in theſe
 things. And he is ſlack,
 and ſleepy, who gives
 full ſwinge to his hate
 ful Luſts, being the
 Devil's Diſciple, and
 who dies in them.
 So that it is very high
 ly our Duty to be di
 ligently watchful and
 wary againſt the temp
 tations of the Devil,
 and earneſtly to call
 upon God; and to en
 treat of him his help,
 that thro' his merciful
 neſs we may at the end
 of our Lives, ſo be
 found watching in good
 works,

APPENDIX.

ðurh his miðneop-
nytte. þ þe on upum
elise timan swa paci-
gense beon on goðum
ðærum þæt þe swiððan
a ur gesehtan magan
7 motan on ecepe
perre. Nu ic hæbbe be-
suman ðæle ahneþoð
beðam ðæghyamlican
tiban þenungan ðe man
to nyðrihte ðon sceall.

Donne is mycel þe-
anf þ man unse-
reande þ man to ea-
can þam oðre. 7 unrel-
ðan sceall goð hepan.
7 to goðe clypan for
manegum neoðan. eall
swa se apostol cwæð.
Sine intermissione o-
rate. þ is. Beoð a sym-
ble eow gebedende 7
eow se apostol cwæð.
Sine enim manducatis.
sine bibitis. sine ali-
quo qui facitis. om-
nia in gloriam dei fa-
citis. þæt is. Eow ge-
etan. oððon ðrincan
oððon elles hwæt pyp-
cean. ðon þæt gedon.
oðð eall goðe þanci-
ende 7 hefigende. Beo
þæt ðinga þæt hit beo
þæt

works, that we may
for ever after be able
and permitted to take
our repose in everlast-
ing Rest. Now have I in
some measure treated of
the times for the daily
Service of God which
Men are in Duty bound
to perform.

It is also very neces-
sary that Men should
understand how to add
often to these, and not
to be seldom, i. e., back-
ward in praising God,
and calling upon him,
on many Occasions.
As the Apostle saith,
† *Be always praying.*
And afterwards the A-
postle says, || *If ye
eat, or drink, or do any
thing else, do all, thank-
ing, and praising God.*
Be there any thing
that a Man should do
in his charge, or em-
ployment, let him beg
God's assistance, and it
always speeds the bet-
ter

APPENDIX.

þæt reman to note pyp-
cean pýlle. biððe he ȝoð
fuldumer a ða him ſpepþ
þe bet. eall ſpa ðauð
cƿæð. Abiutor meur
eſto domine. þ ʒ. Min
brihten beo min ful-
tum. ʒ eſt he cƿæð.
Abiutorium noſtrum
in nomine domini. qui
fecit celum ʒ tērram.
þ ʒ.

Upe fuldum ʒ ȝoð.
De ȝerceop ʒ ȝe-
rophete.

Deoſonar ʒ eoðan.
And ealle ȝerceapta.

ȝoð ur ȝerultu-
mige.

To upe ðearfe.

Spa hir pýlla ʒ.

Amen.

ter with him; as *Da-
vid* ſaith, *Adjutor. &c.*
My Lord, be my Help.
And again he ſays, *Ad-
jutorium, &c.* that is,

God is our aid,
Who made and did
create

The Heavens and
Earth.

And all the Crea-
tures.

God be our aid

When e'er we ſtand
in need,

According to his will.

Amen.



FINIS.

Books printed for RICHARD SARE.

THE Works of Flavius Josephus, Translated into English. Folio.

Fables of Æsop, and other eminent Mythologists, with Morals and Reflections. Folio.

Fables and Stories Moralized, being a second Part of the Fables of Æsop, and other eminent Mythologists. Folio.

Select Colloquies out of Erasmus. Octavo.

Quevedo's Visions. These five by Sir Roger L'Estrange.

The Genuine Epistles of St. Barnabas, St. Ignatius, St. Clement, St. Polycarp, the Shepherd of Hermas, with a large preliminary Discourse. Octavo.

A practical Discourse against prophane Swearing. Octavo.

The Authority of Christian Princes over Ecclesiastical Synods, in Answer to a Letter to a Convocation Man. Octavo.

An Appeal to all the true Members of the Church of England on behalf of the King's Supremacy. Octavo.

The Principles of the Christian Religion explained, in a brief Commentary upon the Church Catechism. The Second Edition. Octavo.

The Church of Rome no Guide in Matters of Faith, in Answer to a Letter from a Nephew to his Uncle, &c. Octavo.

The State of the Church, and Clergy of England, in their Councils, Synods, Convocations, Conventions, and other publick Assemblies; Historically deduced from the Conversion of the Saxons, to the present Times. With a large Appendix of Original Writs, and other Instruments.

Also Sermons upon special Occasions.

These by Dr. Wake Dean of Exeter.

Epictetus's Morals, with Simplicius's Comment, in English. The Second Edition, with the Addition of the Life of Epictetus. Octavo.

The Christian Pattern, or a Treatise of the Imitation of Christ, in four Books. Written Originally in Latin by Thomas a Kempis, now render'd into English. To which are added Meditations and Prayers for sick Persons, in Octavo, with Cuts, and also in Twelves.

Parson's his Christian Directory, being a Treatise of Holy Resolution, in two Parts, purged from all Errors, and put into modern English, &c. Octavo.

The Truth and Excellence of the Christian Religion, asserted, against Jews, Infidels, and Hereticks. In sixteen Sermons, preach'd

preach'd at the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, in the Years 1701, 1702. being the Lecture founded by the Honourable Robert Boyle. Quarto.

Also several Sermons upon special Occasions.

These by Dr. Stanhope Dean of Canterbury.

A short View of the Prophaness and Immorality of the English Stage, with the sense of Antiquity upon this Argument.

A Defence of the Short View of the Prophaness and Immorality of the English Stage, &c. Being a Reply to Mr. Congreve's Amendments, &c. Octavo.

A Second Defence of the Short View, &c. In Answer to a Book Entituled, The Ancient and Modern Stages vindicated. Octavo.

The Emperor M. Antoninus his Conversation with himself, together with the preliminary Discourse of the learned Grotius. As also the Emperor's Life, written by M. D'Acier, and supported by the Authorities collected by Dr. Stanhope, to which is added, the mythological Picture of Cebes the Theban: Translated into English from their respective Originals.

A Disswative from the Playhouse, price 3 d.

These five by Mr. Collier.

Maxims and Reflections on Plays, written in French by the Bishop of Meaux, with an Advertisement concerning the Book and the Translation, by Mr. Collier. Octavo.

The Turkish Spy in 8 Volumes. The second Edition. Twelves.

Humane Prudence. The ninth Edition.

Le Moynes Art of Writing and Judging of History.

Mackenzie's Essay upon Reason.

Sir S. Degg's Parson's Councillor, or the Law of Tithes. Octavo.

An Answer to all the Excuses and Pretences which Men ordinarily make for their not coming to the Holy Communion, price 3 d.

A Gentleman's Religion in three Parts, the first contains the Principles of Natural Religion. The second and third the Doctrines of Christianity, both as to Faith and Practice, with an Appendix, wherein it is proved that nothing contrary to our Reason can possibly be the Object of our Belief; but that it is no just Exception to some of the Doctrines of Christianity that they are above our Reason. Twelves.

Some short and plain Directions for spending one day well, price 1 d.

Plain Instructions to the Young and Ignorant, price 3 d.

An Essay towards making the Knowledge of Religion easie to the meanest capacity, price 2 d.

These five by the same Author.

The Canon of the New Testament Vindicated, in Answer to the Objections of J. Toland. By John Richardson, B. D. formerly Fellow of Emanuel College Cambridge. The second Edition.

The Christian Scholar, price 3 d.

A Paraphrase and Comment on all the Epistles and Gospels, appointed to be used in the Church of England on all Sundays and Holy-days throughout the Year, first and second Volumes, the third and fourth Volumes now printing.

A new Institute of the Imperial or Civil Law. With Notes shewing in some principal Cases, amongst other Observations, how the Canon Law, and the Laws of England, and the Laws and Customs of other Nations differ from it, Octavo.

A Treatise of Laws in General. Of their Nature and Design, and of the Interpretation of them, Translated out of French. Being a proper Introduction to the New Institute of the Imperial or Civil Law, with Notes, &c. lately published, Octavo.

Of the Law of Nature and Nations, Eight Books. Written Originally in Latin, by the Baron Pufendorf, Counsel of State to the late King of Sweeden. Translated into English. Folio.

Thoughts on Religion and other Subjects, by Monsieur Pascal. Translated out of French, Octavo.

The Christian Casuist, or a Treatise resolving several Cases of Conscience. Written by Mr. Plater, and translated into English. Octavo.

Pastoral Instructions and Meditations for an Annual Retirement of ten Days recommended to the Clergy of his Diocess. By Anthony Godeau, Bishop of Grasse and Venne. Octavo.

These four translated by Bas. Kennet, Fellow of Corpus Christi College in Oxford.

The Nature and Design of Holy Days explained: Or short and plain Reasons and Instructions for the Observation of the Feasts and Fasts of the Church of England, adapted to the meanest capacity, price 6 d. or 40 s. per hundred.

Memoirs of Henry Guthry, late Bishop of Dunkel in Scotland, where in the Conspiracy and Rebellion, against King Charles the First of Blessed Memory, till the time of the Murther of that Monarch, are briefly and faithfully related. Octavo.

Arcana Clericalia: Or the Misteries of Clerkship explained. Declaring, Defining and Illustring the essential and formal

mal parts of Deeds, and their Nature, Operation and Use in Conveying, Limiting, and Settling Estates, &c. By George Billingham, late of Gray's-Inn, Esq; Now very much enlarged with select modern Precedents. Octavo.

The Law of Estates Taile, and Remainders, and Reversions, expartant thereupon, illustrated, &c. the Doctrine of Perpetuities fully cleared, &c. Octavo.

The Devout Christian's daily Manual, consisting of Prayers and Devotions for all Occasions, &c. supervised and recommended by the Reverend Mr. Wagstaff. Twelves.

Mr. Boyer's Dictionary, French and English, both in Quarto and Octavo.

— His French Grammar in Octavo, design'd for the use of the Duke of Gloucester.

Mr. Hooker's Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. Folio.

Dalton's Office of a Justice of the Peace, revised and enlarged. Folio.

Humane Prudence, or the Art by which a Man may raise Himself and Fortune to Grandure.

A Gentleman instructed in the conduct of a Virtuous and Happy Life. The second Edition. Twelves.

The Amours of Edward the Fourth, a Novel.

The Julian and Gregorian Year, or the difference between the Old and New Style.